THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 11. FEBRUARY, 1939. Vol. XXVIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Liberal Catholic Group.

A body of influential and scholarly Anglo-Catholics, including the Deans of Winchester, Exeter and York, have formed themselves into a Liberal-Catholic group. Their action has been prompted by the existing situation in the English Church in the spheres of worship and doctrine. They write:

> 'There are many people in England who, though they rarely attend the services of the Church, have a real sense of the need for religion. We believe that a large number have given up the practice of going to church either because they have been offered a form of worship which does not satisfy their needs or because the Christian religion has been inadequately presented to them. . . . We believe that, if Anglo-Catholicism is to play the part which it might, certain present tendencies must be counteracted in regard alike to worship and to teaching.
>
> A Catholic interpretation of the Church of England has been maintained from the sixteenth century onwards by many of the most learned Anglican theologians; it has shown its power to co-operate with other schools of thought, both at home and abroad, and has exercised a profound influence on English religion, culture and life. But it must be put forward both in teaching and practice in a form which meets the needs of the present time. In regard to worship we recognize that reforms and improvements of the Prayer-book are urgently needed, and we believe that a settlement of the controversies of the past is both possible and desirable.'

While themselves holding fast to many of the traditional doctrines of the Church—for instance, the Virgin Birth and the

Bodily Resurrection — as historical facts, the members of the Liberal Catholic group are yet convinced that most serious regard must be paid to modern research and modern criticism in the presentation of Christian doctrine to-day. They write :

> 'We reject the belief that the teaching of the undivided Church should be regarded as settling all questions for all time without respect to the advance of thought and knowledge. . . . We reject the view often put forward by some Anglo-Catholics which denies that a drastic reform of religion was needed in the sixteenth century, and we believe that in spite of the losses involved the Reformation produced some very real gains. Consequently we deplore the tendency to assume that Anglo-Catholics must hold that any divergence from the general outlook of Roman Catholic theology, or from Thomist philosophy, is necessarily erroneous. In particular we cannot accept the belief that specific theological statements can be assumed to be infallible simply because they have been laid down by Popes or General Councils or because they have hitherto been generally accepted by the Church as a whole. We believe that the Holy Spirit is always guiding the Church into all truth and therefore that there has been development of doctrine. But such development is consistent with the possibility that a pronouncement made in the past, which expressed the truth of God at the time in so far as man's knowledge then enabled him to understand it, may need to be modified or corrected in the light of fuller knowledge. The belief that the Bible is free from error has in practice been abandoned under the compulsion of the advance of knowledge. The same is true of various pronouncements of ecclesiastical authority. In these circumstances we find it hard to resist the conclusion that "infallibility" is discredited, and that Catholic authority needs to be distinguished from "infallibility" if it is to play its full and necessary part in the life and teaching of the Church.
>
> Our belief that the Church is continually being guided into all truth and that this guidance of the Holy Spirit may lead to the modification and correction of particular beliefs enables us to face the possibility of such changes without the danger of that loss to religion which has resulted in the past from a refusal to accept changes except under compulsion. The attempt of orthodox Christianity to defend the verbal inerrancy of the Scriptures until forced to abandon it was a serious factor in bringing about unbelief, and we desire to see established a conception of doctrinal authority which will preserve the Church from similar mistakes in the future, by recognizing that reason no less than scripture and tradition has a vital part to play in the authority of the Church.. . . . We insist that the truth of the Gospel must be established, not by appeals to the formularies of the "undivided Church," but by free discussion which accepts the principles of scientific criticism.
>
> As a result of these considerations we hold that freedom to discuss the historical truth of the narratives of the Gospel, carrying with it the right to express doubt as to that historical truth, must be allowed if the truth of such narratives is to be established by the free consensus of Christian opinion.'

Such affirmations must have the whole-hearted support of every Modernist, for they affirm those central convictions for

which Modernists have striven for many years. And yet it would not be just to think of those who are dubbed Modernists as being alone responsible for theological development in the English Church. A notable advance was made by the authors of *Lux Mundi* under the leadership of Gore, who had to face the keenest opposition from those Anglo-Catholics who declined to advance with him. The more recent volume, *Essays Catholic and Critical*, marked another stage in this Anglo-Catholic progress. We have no doubt that under the able guidance of its leaders this newly-formed Liberal Anglo-Catholic group will continue this advance. Responsible Modernists recognize that the continuity of Christian thought must be combined with new theological thinking, and no group in the English Church is more capable of achieving this than the courageous and scholarly leaders of the Liberal Catholic school.

What is true of Christian thought is no less true of Christian worship. Our Church worship needs to be reformed in a spirit in which old controversies are forgotten. But that reform must be achieved on English Prayer Book lines. It is revision, not revolution, that our Church public worship stands in need of. There is nothing new in this. During the last four hundred years we have had a number of generally acceptable revisions, and we are quite capable, under sound and united leadership, of again securing such an acceptable and generally beneficial revision of our Church services. The Liberal Anglo-Catholic leaders are conscious of the need. They are convinced that a servile imitation of Continental and Irish Uses and mediaeval mannerisms will not give English Church folk what they need. They rightly assert:

> 'In regard to worship, we recognize that reforms and improvements of the Prayer Book are urgently needed, and we believe that a settlement of the controversies of the past is both possible and desirable. But in present conditions the Church in England is largely a missionary Church. It must adopt missionary methods, and it must seek to build upon such religious traditions as are available. In consequence, it is a matter of great importance that, so far as is in any way possible, changes in forms of worship should be based upon and grow out of the forms of worship contained in the Book of Common Prayer, which is familiar to the English people as a whole, and rightly valued by them, rather than involve the introduction of forms which are alien to our religious history. We desire to see in Anglo-Catholic churches forms of service which are recognizably Prayer Book services.'

The Liberal Catholic Group are loyal to the fundamental

principles of the English Church, both in doctrine and worship, in taking the line which they declare themselves resolved to take. If they can win the great body of Anglo-Catholic Churchmen to follow them, they will have done not a little to save the English Church from that spirit of fanatical retrogression which at present is paralyzing its powers and dividing its resources. We hail as the auspice of a better age this creation of a Liberal-Catholic Group which should co-operate as the counterpart of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement in a united advance into the truth under the leadership of the Spirit of Freedom and Love.

A New Editor for Theology.

Another very notable Anglo-Catholic step forward is apparent in the January issue of *Theology*.* This theological magazine, founded in 1920, and read mainly by the scholarly clergy—its title has little attraction for the laity—has secured a new editor, the Rev. Alec Vidler, Librarian of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden. Mr. Vidler is well-known as perhaps the most liberal of Anglo-Catholic publicists. His published works include, *Sex, Marriage, and Religion* (1923), *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church* (1934), *A Plain Man's Guide to Christianity* (1936) and a volume on *The Development of Modern Catholicism* written in conjunction with the Rev. Wilfred Knox.

The bright yellow cover of the new number of *Theology* symbolises the primrose of a spiritual Spring. In his retrospect and prospect with which the new number opens, the Editor affirms his loyalty to the tradition of the Review and describes the aims of the periodical in the new stage on which it is entering :

> ' (*a*) To provide a medium through which all that is best in contemporary theology may reach the clergy, the laity, and those outside the Church who are looking towards Christianity for a reasonable and relevant faith :
>
> (*b*) to serve as an organ where Anglican writers with different associations and various special interests may meet and contribute to the clarification and exposition of the faith which has their allegiance :
>
> (*c*) to serve as a liaison between theological thought and those movements in contemporary literature, art and political philosophy which are working towards a re-discovery of the significance of the Christian tradition.'

* S.P.C.K. 1/- per copy.

We wish *Theology* well under its third editor. It has no easy task to accomplish in treading the Catholic and Critical Way, for so many of the Catholics are not critical and so many of the Critics are not catholic.

A Second Defeat for the Reactionaries in Convocation.

Once again the reactionaries in the Lower Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York attempted to secure from the Upper Houses of their respective Provinces resolutions which could be interpreted as authoritatively limiting, if not rejecting, that doctrinal freedom for the Church of England which follows as a natural consequence from the acceptance of the Doctrinal Report by the Bishops. And for the second time the reactionaries suffered a crushing defeat. In the Upper House of Canterbury the bishops declined to modify their former decision by a vote of fifteen to three. The Bishop of Derby in moving the resolution, in which he was seconded by the Bishop of Norwich,

> 'pleaded for freedom of inquiry into questions concerning faith and doctrine, and urged that it was unwise always to attempt to limit the interpretation of the Church's formal standards of doctrine' (*Times*, Jan. 21).

In the Upper House of York the bishops, *nemine contra dicente*, rejected a petition from the Lower House of that Province praying for a declaration from the House of Bishops on the authoritative standard of doctrine in the Church of England and asking for an interpretation of those standards. The *Times* report states :

> 'The Bishop of Carlisle (Dr. Williams) deprecated as very dangerous the suggestion that the House should declare that the Church of England held the teaching of the Nicene Creed in the sense only in which it had ever been held in the history of the Church, and that it could not be set aside by private interpretations of the events which constituted the earthly life of Our Lord. . . . He moved that they inform the Lower House that the history of the Church supplied much evidence of the unwisdom of any attempt to limit interpretation by authoritative declaration, and that they were convinced that the wise course was not to prescribe the interpretation in addition to the standard, but to lay the obligation of always maintaining integrity of mind and sincerity of conscience, together with reverence for the continuous tradition of the Church.
>
> The Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Warman) supported the motion. He said that if they allowed themselves to interpret the Creeds of the Church in too strict and narrow a sense they would run the risk of hindering the vocation of a good many of their best candidates.'

We hope that this second check will now terminate the agitation. Those who are responsible for the agitation are undoubtedly well-meaning men, but the alarm which they have felt and propagated is unnecessary, and the methods by which they have sought to attain their ends are as contrary to the essential spirit of the Christian Church as they are to the welfare and influence of the Church of England.

Dr. Rawlinson and Lord Hugh Cecil.

The manifesto of the Liberal Anglo-Catholic Group received a mixed reception in the press. The *Times*, while generally appreciative of the declaration, takes exception to its claim that freedom to discuss the historicity of events related to Gospel narratives must be conceded to the clergy. This drew the following letter from Dr. Rawlinson, to whose steady courage the Church has owed much in its present crisis:

> Sir,—The second leading article in to-day's issue of *The Times* quotes from a recent manifesto a statement in which the signatories, while professing their own belief in the historical truth of Our Lord's Virgin Birth and His bodily Resurrection from the dead, add also that 'freedom to discuss the historical truth of the narratives of the Gospel, carrying with it the right to express doubt as to that historical truth, must be allowed.' While conceding the right to this freedom of opinion to people in general, you remark, somewhat baldly, that 'the right of anyone who conscientiously disbelieves parts of the Creed to take office in a Church which is based upon those Creeds, and privately to deny what publicly, by reason of his office, he must affirm' is quite another thing.
>
> I cannot but think that the line taken in the recent Report on Doctrine in the Church represents a wiser handling of an admittedly difficult question. The difference between the position of an ordained minister in this matter and that of a baptized lay worshipper does not rest upon the obligation to recite the Creeds in worship; for that obligation is common to both clergy and laity. In the interests of intellectual freedom for the Church's lay members, it is, in my judgment, essential that the principle should be recognized that to affirm the Creeds in worship must not necessarily be understood to involve a profession of detailed orthodoxy, but a general desire to be indentified in loyalty with the Church's historic witness to the Christian faith taken broadly and as a whole.
>
> The difference between the position of the clergy and that of the laity in the matter is a real one; but it rests on a different basis. It arises from the fact that the clergy are authorized and official teachers of the Christian faith. From this point of view, I would submit that the true principles are laid down on page 39 of the published Report of the recent Commission on Doctrine. I am aware that the Report in question does not possess formal or official authority. I quote from it simply as a weighty statement which has been officially commended

by the unanimous episcopate to the serious consideration of the Church. In the passage to which I have referred, the Commissioners, after laying it down that 'the Church has a right to satisfy itself that those who teach in its name adequately represent and express its mind,' proceed to add that

> no individual can claim to receive the teacher's commission as a right, and the commission itself involves the obligation not to teach, as the doctrine of the Church, doctrine which is not in accordance with the Church's mind.

They continue:

> If any authorized teacher puts forward personal opinions which diverge . . . from the traditional teaching of the Church, he should be careful to distinguish between such opinions and the normal teaching which he gives in the Church's name; and, so far as possible, such divergences should be so put forward as to avoid offending consciences.

It should be manifest that in relation to the modern intellectual situation it is essential that modern problems of historical criticism should be freely investigated in the Church, and that it is part of the duty of properly educated persons in Holy Orders to pursue such investigations. Provided that the principles stated in the sentences which I have quoted from the Doctrinal Report are observed, I would submit that it is desirable that the clergy should retain the generally recognized freedom of investigation which they at present enjoy. The recent utterances of the episcopate of both Provinces in the last two groups of sessions of the Convocations of the Church make it quite clear that a reasonable liberty in these matters and a consideration for intellectually scrupulous consciences will continue to be the general policy. The matter is of real importance from the point of view of the recruiting of ordination candidates, properly qualified to confront the intellectual questions involved in the presentation of Christian truth to the modern world.

Yours, etc.,

Breadsall Mount, near Derby, Jan. 21. JOHN DERBY.

To Dr. Rawlinson, Lord Hugh Cecil replied in a letter in which Bourbon complacency, the 'chastity of honour,' and a superficiality which fails to grasp the essential difficulties of the situation, struggled for mastery.

Sir, — I cannot help thinking that the Bishop of Derby does not weigh sufficiently the mischief caused by the Christian ministry falling, or seeming to fall, below the standard of honour observed by normally honest men.

To be the salaried official of an association professing to teach as fundamental, certain tenets, and then to teach that those tenets are very doubtful or probably untrue, seems clearly to fall below the normal standard of honour. The distinction which (as I understand him) the Bishop seeks to draw between the personal teaching of a minister and the teaching he gives in the name of the Church is surely morally unsatisfactory. For obviously an evangelist who while he is preaching the Gospel officially at the same time publishes his personal opinion

that that Gospel is in some respects untrue would cut a strange and, above all, an unconvincing figure. Indeed, the Bishop's excuse seems to me one of those disingenuous sophistries into which we slide when we have to defend something not perfectly straightforward.

I know it is said by a *tu quoque* that other schools of thought transgress—notably the extreme Anglo-Catholics in failing to observe the directions of the Prayer-book. But two wrongs do not make a right; moreover, influential voices are even now urging the moral duty of a more scrupulous obedience to the Prayer-book. It would be lamentable if the episcopate were understood in any degree to sanction entering upon the ministry by those who do not entirely accept the Creed. The case of those who having entered afterwards feel doubts is to be sure a hard one; and I would ask of them no more than to keep silent on those subjects on which their teaching can no longer be both orthodox and sincere. But no one who is in doubt about the Creed ought to be ordained; and I suggest that a Bishop who knowingly ordained such a one would act very wrongly. He would make himself the accomplice of dishonour.

Then on the practical side the Bishop of Derby seems open to criticism. It is, of course, quite true that the investigation of the truth of theological teaching must sometimes be undertaken. But this is not a normal function of the Church or its ministry. The Church is not a study-circle nor a theological college; it is rather an Evangelist or a Prophet. And to seem hesitating about the purport of its message, instead of declaring it fully and confidently, enervates the Church and destroys its evangelistic power. As it seems to me, the difficulties of the last eighty years have now been settled, and are not likely to recur. They never deeply affected the Creed, though both traditionalists and innovators seemed to think that they must. At any rate, in the future researches in physical science or in historical criticism are not likely to add to the data upon which we must form our judgment as to whether the Articles of the Creed are true or untrue. The earthquake is over, and we can now count up the damage and note the necessary repairs. We have not really suffered severely; and nothing of the same kind is likely to happen again.

The Creed now stands firm; and since the Bishops think it is a true Creed, they should conform to the general standard of honour by insisting that the ministry should teach it wholly and clearly.

I am yours faithfully,

HUGH CECIL.

This letter received the following discriminating and conclusive reply from Dr. Rawlinson, although we fear no such reply can be really conclusive for those who do not recognize that loyalty to the Christian Faith ought not to be identified with the profession of literal assent to doctrinal formularies many centuries old, couched in language and based on pre-suppositions which in certain cases are of necessity out of date.

SIR,—I have no desire to enter into a controversy with Lord Hugh Cecil, who is a very good friend of mine; nor do I propose to write further letters beyond this. I would, however, point out, in reply to

Lord Hugh, that an ordained minister of the Church of Christ is a good deal more than merely 'the salaried official of an Association.' He is not just the hired agent of a particular kind of propaganda; he is the servant of Him who is the Truth. He must, indeed, be a convinced Christian, and sufficiently orthodox to be rightly entrusted with the responsibilities of a Christian teacher. But he is pledged by his ordination vows to be a life-long student of Holy Scripture, and if intellectual issues arise it is his duty to face them. I do not myself think that the substance of Christian orthodoxy is seriously in peril, or that the Christian faith is unable to maintain itself in the modern world. But I think that it must be maintained in the atmosphere of freedom, and that Lord Hugh Cecil does not sufficiently take account of the real complexity of the problems which may sometimes arise.

I am bound to say that I do not think that the situation is helped by Lord Hugh's suggestion that those who do not share his views are 'falling, or seeming to fall, below the standard of honour observed by normally honest men.' I find it difficult to believe that anyone who will read carefully the passage on page 39 of the Doctrinal Report to which my original letter made reference, and who will do so with the realities of the modern situation in mind, will be disposed to accuse either the Bishop of Derby or the distinguished colleagues with whom he had the honour of being associated in signing the Report on Doctrine of being guilty of 'disingenuous sophistries.'

Yours, etc.,

Breadsall Mount, near Derby, Jan. 28. JOHN DERBY.

CRITICISM FROM KELHAM.

The Rev. A. G. Hebert, S.S.M., of Kelham, in his *Memorandum on the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine** commends with faint praise and criticises with considerable vigour the Doctrinal Report. His *Memorandum* was prepared at the request of the Church Union — the chief Anglo-Catholic society in this country — and was authorized by it for publication. It notes various attitudes towards the Doctrinal Report.

(1) There are those who regard the Report as the utterance of a 'city of confusion.' This no doubt is the attitude of Romanist controversialists and with it Mr. Hebert will have nothing to do.

(2) That 'from the point of view of orthodox Christian belief, the Report is an alarming symptom of a progressive deterioration of Anglican teaching.' Although it is marked by a retreat from Modernism it is marred by concessions to Modernism. Mr. Hebert likes the second half of the Report very much be-

*S.P.C.K. 1/-. 1939.

cause it seems to him to be truly Catholic, but he dislikes the earlier and more fundamental half of the Report because it seems to him to be lamentably Modernist.

(3) That the Report is 'a generation out of date.' With this verdict Mr. Hebert concurs. We would point out, however, it is undoubtedly true that the Report is a generation out of date in the sense that a fresh set of problems has arisen for Christian leaders and teachers since the doctrinal Commission was appointed in 1922, and that these problems are very naturally not treated in the Report. Nevertheless, the Report is not out of date in the sense that the problems with which the Report deals have been happily and finally solved in our thought and teaching. These problems are unsolved in many cases, and what is more, they have got to be solved, however difficult and unpleasant the task of solving them may prove to be.

We are well acquainted with those who claim robustly that various Biblical and doctrinal problems have been solved once and for all, and therefore decline to be further troubled with them. They are like the schoolboys who are entirely satisfied to get the right answers to their sums even if they get them from the back of their arithmetic book, but resent the demand that the problem shall be solved by the right method. Let such continue to dwell in their fools' paradise. There are many others however who, knowing the problems are not solved, must proceed laboriously and patiently to solve them under, as they hope, the guidance of the Spirit of Truth. For such the methods of solution proposed by the Doctrinal Report have the greatest value.

The Problem of the Cup at Holy Communion.

A correspondent has recently pressed upon us that it is not the arguments which assert the danger to health from the use of a common Cup in Holy Communion which to-day lead people to abstain from communicating. That objection has very largely broken down at the bar of medical criticism. What repels many to-day from the use of the common Cup is a feeling of delicacy. They do not like drinking from a cup from which many others have drunk, even though it be first wiped with a purificator. Our correspondent, who recognizes the difficulty of using a number

of little cups, presses once again for the method of intinction — the dipping of the consecrated bread or wafer into the Cup before giving it to the communicant. There are difficulties connected with intinction which we cannot go into here, beyond pointing out, that it has not been in use in the Church of England since the Reformation, and is therefore not legal. It will seem to many that if little cups be not used and if intinction be not used, then it only remains to follow the Roman practice of not administering the Cup to the laity. But to take away the Cup from the laity would be to go back upon what has been regarded as a triumph of the Reformation which secured, after a tremendous struggle, the restoration of the Cup to the laity. Loyalty to the terms of the Institution of the Holy Communion, and also to the custom of the primitive Church, requires that every Christian should receive the Cup, and therefore that it is entirely wrong for the Church authorities not to present it to him at the Eucharist. This argument seems to us to be irrefutable.

A solution of the difficulty has occurred to us. This solution was suggested by an experience at a guest night in one of our Inns of Court. The guest sat between two legal luminaries. The Loving Cup was passed round and all stood for the ceremony. The cup was passed to the legal luminary on the guest's right hand. He bowed, took the cup with both hands, and ceremoniously raised it towards his lips, but did not drink from it. He then turned, bowed, and presented the cup to the guest. Later, he defended his omission to drink from the Loving Cup, maintaining that he had by his action in receiving the cup, entered fully into the spirit of the ceremony, although he had not actually drunk from the cup.

Could not such freedom be permitted in the Church? The minister, representing the Fellowship of the Faithful, presents the Chalice to the communicant: the communicant devoutly receives the same, but decides for himself, as he raises it towards his lips, whether or not he shall actually drink from it. Such a solution would seem to be entirely in accordance with the spirit of the English Church. In presenting the Cup to the instructed communicant, that Church, through its minister, does what it ought to do, and the communicant is left free to decide for himself whether he will drink from it or not.

ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

The Roman Catholic Church in countries in which there is a strong Reformed Church exhibits in various ways the beneficial effects of such association. The celebration by our English Reformed Churches last year of the 400th anniversary of the publication of the Great English Bible has had its effect, so it would seem, on the Roman Church in this country. Fr. Ronald Knox, so it is reported, has been authorised to produce a revised English version of the Scriptures, or perhaps only of the New Testament, for English Roman Catholics. The version is officially authorised to be made from the Vulgate.

The Vulgate owes its existence to the energetic labours of that great scholar, St. Jerome, and was published in the ninth decade of the fourth century. Pope Damasus had authorised Jerome to produce a revision of the existing Latin Version of the Scriptures. St. Jerome, however, was not the kind of scholar to be restricted by his papal commission and his revision became in many parts a new translation. He made use also of various codices of the original Greek for his New Testament Vulgate, and being a good Hebrew scholar, had recourse to the Hebrew codices for the Vulgate of the Old Testament. Notwithstanding Jerome's great ability, the Vulgate is not free from many errors. Some of these are due to Jerome having not made use of the best text, in other cases the errors are due to a failure to grasp the precise significance of the original. An example of the first class of error is the inclusion in the Vulgate of I *John* v, 8, the passage known as 'The Three Heavenly Witnesses,' which certainly had no place in the original text.

An example of the second class of error is the rendering 'one fold' (*ovile*) for 'one flock' in the notable declaration in *John* x, 16, 'They shall become one *flock*, one Shepherd' (English Revised Version). Of this Vulgate mistranslation the great Bishop Westcott wrote that it had been 'Most disastrous in idea and in influence.' For it misses the important point stressed in the original that the bond of union between all Christians is dependent upon the common relationship of each to One Lord and is not dependent upon inclusion within a single ring-wall.

We hope that Mr. Ronald Knox will treat his commission to produce a new English Version of the Scriptures for English

Roman Catholic readers with the same freedom with which St. Jerome in his day interpreted the papal commission which authorised his undertaking.

The English Roman Catholic laity are at present officially dependent — if they use an English Bible — upon the Rheims-Douay Version made in late Tudor and early Jacobean times. This translation even with its later revisions is very inferior to both our English Authorised and Revised Versions.

It would appear that there is pressing need for this revision since in some Roman Catholic Churches in England, the laudable practice is growing up of reading to the congregation at the Mass an English translation of the Epistle and Gospel after they have first been read in the Latin.

ANGLICAN WORSHIP AND SOCIAL LIFE*

By the Rev. J. S. Bezzant, B.D., Canon-residentiary and Chancellor of Liverpool Cathedral.

CORPORATE worship is the breath of life to a religious society. The essence of worship is adoration. It is offered to God : it is not directed to the instruction and information of man. Worship will always have its effects upon sincere worshippers, but those effects are the inevitable result of worship rather than its purpose, and they take the form of inspiration rather than of exhortation.

The great theologians who have treated this subject emphasize that the true worship of God is the life of service of the will of God in all the activities of life. We are to present ourselves, souls and bodies, as a living sacrifice, acceptable to God. This, as St. Paul says, is reasonable worship. Any form of worship not in vital relation with that sacrifice is for the Christian a relapse into superstition. Formal acts of worship on special occasions, expressed in particular rites and symbolic in form, can never be a substitute for the life of dedicated service of the

* A paper read to a conference organized by the Industrial Christian Fellowship to consider *The Social Significance of Worship*.

will of God. But neither can the true worship of God afford to dispense with the aids and stimulations which the symbolic acts of public worship by the Christian Society can so abundantly supply. By the ascent of our fitful and changing minds to their eternal source and background, which is the perfect Divine Reason, we are inspired and enabled to live more reasonably among the confusions and baffling perplexities of life. By the contemplation of the perfect righteousness of God, and the consecration of our wills to His service, our efforts after righteousness are inspired and our wills disciplined for service in a world of half-lights in which unrighteousness abounds. By the conscious contemplation of the eternal and perfect love of God, which believes in men when they no longer believe in themselves, those human capacities upon which all social relationships in the last resort depend, are purified from unselfishness, and redeemed from the self-satisfaction and arrogance which the service of our fellow-men always tends to engender unless it be service in the spirit of worship.[1] The sincere worship of God should result in the quickening of every power of body and mind, so that we may more fully and effectively respond to the Divine will in a life of service accordant with that will.

It is not the purpose or even the result of worship to disclose to us any particular social programme. I accept the conclusion of Troeltsch[2] that there is no such thing as an absolute Christian social ethic which only awaits our discovery, whether in worship or by any other means. The earthly scene of human life is ever changing; all we can do is to learn to influence, at the most to direct, human action in the world situation in its successive phases. There will always be the need for the mental and moral wrestling with social problems as they arise and change. Moreover, the mechanism of any economic order is of much less importance than the spirit in which men work it. The result of worship is the deepening of that inner transformation, contrasted with mere conformity to the fashions of the world, through which we are more fitted to discover what the will of

[1] See further an admirable paper by Canon A. L. Lilley entitled *Worship and the Philosophy of Life,* in *The Modern Churchman,* Vol. xviii, pp. 539*ff*.

[2] *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches,* Vol. ii, p. 1013.

God is in particular circumstances, and inspired and strengthened to do it. It is from this point of view that we should judge of the adequacy of the settled forms of worship of the Christian Church. We ought not to judge them by their power of suggesting to us precise lines of practical action in a constantly changing world.

During this conference much consideration will have been given to the Eucharist in relation to the social significance of worship. It is important to remember that participation in the Eucharist presupposes active membership in the Christian Society, including instruction in the significance of its forms of public worship, in its faith and ethical standards. It would be unreasonable to judge of any Eucharistic rite by the impressions it might be expected to make upon some casual reader or observer of it. Now, assuming persons properly nurtured in the Christian fellowship, it seems to me that our English rite is not inadequate from the point of view from which this conference will have considered it, whatever may be thought of it from other points of view. Certainly our Eucharistic rite is the one of all our services least in need of change. In this, the closest act of religious worship and fellowship one with another in Christ, in which the Church offers herself as the body of Christ and each offers himself as a member of that body, it is easier than in any other form of public worship to be in full sympathy with the form and expression of the rite. Indeed, assuming normal intelligence, and that degree of instruction for the lack of which there can never be excuse, I would say of our Eucharistic Order, and of the sacraments generally, that their ministration cannot fail to testify to the value which the Christian religion sets upon man as the child of God in the Divine family, which lies at the root of all right social relationships and duties. It seems to me that they are not inadequate in setting forth the truth (in so far as an order of public worship is an appropriate form for the setting forth of truth) that the Church is not merely an association of believers but a spiritual organism with a world-wide social mission. The forms for the ministration of the sacraments in our Church clearly show God's call to man, that in and through them God comes to man, communicates His own Divine nature in a communion and succour of love; and

that, not because of any particular condition of position, prestige, power, education or wealth, but just because man is man, God's child made in His image which can never be wholly lost, and made for communion with Him. The very existence and operation of the sacraments declare the truths of the Fatherhood of God, of Jesus as the Way to God, of the value of the individual person in the reality of an universal spiritual brotherhood. Those truths, as the consequences of their present eclipse in a large part of the world so plainly show, provide the only sound and enduring basis for social hope. Human life must realize the Divine Fatherhood if it is ever to achieve human brotherhood; it needs the Christian valuation of man if it is to resist the ever-active tendencies to the exploitation of man; and it needs the experience of corporate life in Christ if it is ever to work out its own salvation.

No doubt some changes in the structure and language of our forms of sacramental worship might impress people more vividly with their social implications and significance. I do not think that is so, to any important extent, in regard to our Eucharistic rite. But changes or additions of this nature would be helpful in the order of Confirmation, which is administered at an age when the young Christian is about to enter more fully into the obligations of social life.[3] It may be, I think it is, the case that the moving symbolism of Baptism and Ordination fails to some extent to convey its social significance because of the presence (perhaps I should say prominence in the case of the Baptismal offices) of language which reflects past controversies, no doubt of importance in their day and concerning theological issues never insignificant, but which nevertheless are not uppermost in the religious outlook nowadays and which hardly belong to the essence of those rites. One does not need to underestimate the importance of dogma, or to deny any particular dogma, in order to wish that sacramental rites should embody and declare their significance and beauty free, as far as possible, from the atmosphere and language of controversies which have arisen in connection with the doctrines on which they rest.

[3] *E.g.*, the form of Blessing which closes the Confirmation Rite of 1927-28 is a real improvement, in that it sends worshippers forth from the church with a mission to fulfil in the world.

I do not intend to particularize further because when all I might say on such points had been said, I should still conclude that they are relatively unimportant in our consideration of the social significance of public worship. I should certainly consider it to be a misdirection of energy, sorely needed in other directions, if it were decided that one of the practical results of this conference must be a campaign for a new revision of the Prayer-book in order to secure that the social significance of our forms for the ministration of the sacraments should be made more self-evident in them. If these rites to some extent fail of their full social implications, as indeed they do, the reason is not that they are in themselves inadequate in this respect.

What is needed, and sorely needed, is that the social significance of the sacraments should be more adequately laid upon the consciences of the Christian people who participate in them. First, there must be more, and more effective, *teaching* about the social implications of worship and the sacraments; and adults need it no less than children. Above all, what is needed is the force of realized example. Notwithstanding all that is implied for the responsibilities and activities of social life in sacramental worship, the mass of church-going people do not seem to feel at all keenly any conflict of the sacramental view of life with much that surrounds them in the world as it is. And we have to begin at the house of God. We shall not exercise much greater influence upon the mass of the people than we do at present until the standard and quality of social life, and the discharge of its obligations, *within the practising Christian community*, shine as a light in the world. It is in our corporate Church life that the social implications of our worship must first be actualized. Not until this is achieved on a much higher level than obtains at present will either those who are incorporated into the life of the Church, or the masses of the people outside the Church, realize the social significance of our worship; nor indeed, without that example, was it ever intended that they should do. The failure is a moral rather than a liturgical one.

One of the reasons for failure is in the fact that for very many of those who attend church fairly regularly the Eucharist has little meaning and little place in their lives. We must have regard to the fact that for the large majority of those who would

call themselves church-people, Christian worship means Morning or Evening prayer; only for a small and diminishing number does it mean both. The influence of that revival in Church life which began with the Oxford Movement has greatly increased the prominence of the Eucharist in the public worship and life of the Church, and led to a great increase in the frequency of communions on the part of a section, though still only a section, of church-people. But few would claim that there has yet been an increase in the appreciation of the social significance of worship, or in its translation into daily life, at all commensurate with the increased prominence of the Eucharist or the increase in the number of communions made; and fewer would claim that such a quickening of the social consciousness as may now exist among church-people has been directly due to a realization of the social implications of the Eucharist rather than to other influences. More important than the number of communions made is the number of different communicants by whom they are made. In this matter I think there is less ground for satisfaction than the number of communions made is apt to suggest.[4] I think that the number of communicants is not in a truly healthy relation to the number of communions, and that herein is one possible explanation why the significance of the Eucharist for social life is in fact less than statistics might lead us to expect.

It is not my purpose to say a word in depreciation of the emphasis laid upon the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist or of the social values which that aspect may possess. I recognize that it can be made very vivid and very effective. But I have come to think that the social implications of this aspect of the Eucharist are overshadowed, and therefore weakened, by the type of teaching which often accompanies it. The emphasis in the teaching I have in mind falls, not indeed wrongly but too exclusively, upon what God does for us in the Eucharist, and often upon what He does for us *as individuals*; there is too little emphasis upon *the implications* of what God does for us

[4] There has been an unvarying decline in the number of Easter communicants from 1934 to 1937, reaching a total shrinkage of 93,213 for the three years.

or upon their application in all our relations man with man in the general life of the world. Or again, there is surely an outstanding significance in the Eucharist for social life in the use of elements taken from the material creation, which is so often used for purposes which are not God's, and in their consecration to the holiest of purposes, so that they become the pledges of the presence and the means of the self-giving of God. Yet this most important social significance, capable of endless applications, is weakened and sometimes lost, when we allow ourselves to talk of the Eucharist (as indeed of any other sacrament of the Church) in a way which seems to deny or obscure the sacramental significance of *all else* in God's world. There is too much language about the Eucharist which robs that sacrament of its power to bring home to the minds of devout but not very thoughtful worshippers the essential Gospel message that God is always giving Himself in the ordinary things of everyday life and in life's common experiences. If that happens, the social significance of the sacraments of the Church is certainly obscured. We need to be most careful that we do not make it easy for people to fall back into the pre-Christian idea that we do honour to God by hallowing certain elements of His creation at the cost of profaning all else. If that idea obtains, even sub-consciously, the result is a disastrous divorce of the Church's sacraments from the rest of life and from all other occasions and means of grace, with the further inevitable result that the true social significance of the Church's sacraments is greatly reduced or lost.

Once more, though it is not my purpose to go beyond my subject and make inadequate references to the theology involved, I must point out the danger that the significance of the Eucharist for all the social activities of life is liable to be hidden if we lay emphasis upon the consecration of the elements as meaning, not their setting apart for a specially sacred use, but the effecting of an actual change in their substance or nature. Language which suggests anything like transubstantiation seems inevitably to set what happens in the Eucharist outside, if not in opposition to, the whole natural order, for such language suggests that the natural must be changed, not only in

use but in substance, or being, before it can serve the Divine purpose.

Not less unfortunate, in my view, as tending to obscure the implications and significance for social life of the chief act of the Church's worship, are the prevailing circumstances in which the emphasis upon the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist tends to be separated from the highly socially significant act of corporate communion. Anything which seems to divorce the occasion of worship and of sacrifice from the occasion of communion is bound to weaken the stimulus to the social consciousness which the Eucharist, in its totality, can so abundantly afford. The social reference of really corporate communion can hardly be missed; yet it is nowadays a rare experience when 'the Lord's own service,' at eleven o'clock or later, is the Eucharist at which the largest company of 'the faithful' attend. To make it a matter of primary obligation to attend the Eucharist when there is no corporate communion does, and in my judgment inevitably must, weaken the full social significance of that sacrament. Nor can I honestly conceal my opinion that insistence upon fasting communion has in fact had results which are as unfortunate as they were unintended, and that it now tends to a confusion of values. I can speak disinterestedly; I regard it (for anyone in normal health) as too trivial a discipline to be useful or even to deserve the name. But it has had the effect of forcing the act of communion to an hour at which we have grievously failed to persuade the mass of church-people to make it a great corporate act of worship, in which the great majority of the full members of a local church participate. From the point of view before us, it is a real loss that the reception of Holy Communion has become, in popular esteem, the mark of the specially devout. Moreover, we know that in these days, when amusements occupy so large a place in the lives of the people, they very seldom, unless they are ill, spend a Saturday evening quietly at home. On that evening they tend to retire later than usual. Of the kind of devout preparation for Holy Communion which in former days was common before 'Communion Sunday,' there is nowadays all too little. Even the minority of church-people who receive communion more or less regularly, too often do so

after a hasty rising from sleep, while their faculties are hardly fully active, and generally in company with no more than a small fraction of the members of the local church; and we must add that they not infrequently return to breakfast with a sense of having more than adequately discharged the obligations of Sunday corporate worship. So long as this state of affairs continues, any large hope that the social significance and implications of Eucharistic worship will be at all fully realized is vain.

Still further, I am sure that the modern emphasis which the clergy lay upon the ministry of the sacraments cannot hope to achieve even what they desire if that emphasis is allowed to obscure, or to be divorced from, the complete nature and task of the Christian ministry. 'Be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments'; 'Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in the Congregation'; and the prayer that bishops and curates may, both by their life and doctrine, set forth God's true and living word, and rightly and duly administer His holy sacraments — these quotations, I cannot but think, in the order of their words, indicate the order of the importance of the functions they name, yet many nowadays seem disposed to reverse it. So far as the more effective realization of the social implications of worship are concerned, the tendency will be self-defeating. The sacraments and worship cannot be appreciated in their social implications, or impart their inspirations to the full worship of God in a life of service, if they are divorced from or are not accompanied by adequate preaching and careful teaching — the ministry of the Word of God in its fulness.

The services of Morning and Evening Prayer are clearly much less adequate than the Eucharist for the aspect of public worship we are considering. Yet these are the services which constitute the major part of public worship for most people who attend church, and they are the services which the casual attendant at church understands to be the public worship of the Church of England. Here we are not considering public worship in general, but only one aspect of it, its social significance. It must be admitted that it is an aspect not strikingly apparent in the services appointed for Morning and Evening Prayer. It

may well be, indeed it is the fact, that joining with heart and mind in the common prayers, in the psalms, in the hymns, and in listening to the reading of the Bible, may do much to develop the sense of Christian brotherhood and of the obligations of social beings one to another. But that is an implication of these services which may easily be missed, and is often not unmistakeable in their contents, unless in some striking psalm or lesson.

It is, however, unlikely that the general structure of these services will be altered so as to make the social significance of worship more obvious. It is none the less possible to indicate some improvements which need not interfere with the general structure of these offices. In the first place, the general confession is too general. No doubt it can be adequate for those who are properly instructed, but large numbers of those who attend church cannot at present be truly so described. Like all our forms of confession, it gives the impression (which of course is one-sided rather than wrong) that righteousness is regarded by the Church as too prominently a relation between God and man, and too little as a relation between man and man in society. That, at any rate superficially (and we cannot ignore the fact that our worship is judged superficially), seems to the ordinary man to be a serious misapprehension of Christ's teaching. We must not forget that many of our less regular worshippers, as also many on the fringe of the Church or altogether outside it, have a more sensitive social conscience than many of our regular communicants. To such people our public worship seems almost to ignore, certainly to pass over too lightly, the fact plainly written in the New Testament that the larger part of the true worship of God lies in the relations between man and man, conducted in the spirit of Christ in a spiritual brotherhood. It seems to them that, in our services as often in our teaching, the sins on which we lay most emphasis are private, visible, and palpable wrongs, 'going before to judgment,' while we acquiesce without protest, even with the appearance of sanctioning and sharing, in the grasping, competitive, inhuman life which makes money and other material gain its greatest aim, with little or no regard for social righteousness. Except in the Litany, in which the time

of our wealth is joined with that of our tribulation as an occasion on which we need the Divine deliverance, there is hardly enough recognition in the Prayer-book of our Lord's warnings against avarice and the love of riches. Even in the collect for St. Matthew's Day it is only the *inordinate* love of riches which we pray we may forsake, which represents the general impression the Prayer-book makes upon one for whom the attitude taken in this matter seems to be one of the most important elements in religion. For myself I would not make much of this. We are, I am sure, right to exclude from our settled forms of worship suggestions that outward conditions, such as legislation can secure, can ever by themselves create righteousness. Righteousness, whether private or social, is always first an ideal, a frame of mind, and it is that which it is the business of the Church to produce and to exhibit. It is slightly absurd to judge of settled forms of public worship by the number of hortatory statements upon precise social obligations which are to be found in them.

Nevertheless, for the aspect of public worship we have in mind, as indeed for other aspects, the Psalter requires a much more searching selection than it has so far officially received. In public worship only those psalms should be used which approach the spirit of Christ. In Liberal Jewish synagogues there is a complete avoidance of psalms which fall below what is there accepted as the highest moral standard. The Lectionary also, even in its revised form, needs further drastic revision in the same spirit. I recognize that the less advanced sections of Holy Scripture have their value in relation to the whole process of revelation; but I think that the occasions for showing their value in this respect are the occasions of teaching, more particularly in classes for Bible study, and not the occasions of public worship, when the misunderstandings they are liable to create are much more probable than their effective removal. A worshipper really gains nothing more from hearing our Lord's words, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven,' if a few minutes earlier he has said or chanted the very different words, 'Blessed shall he be that taketh thy children: and throweth them against the stones.' Only the best should be used in public worship; other-

wise what is less or lower than the best, and what appears to be archaic or incongruous, attract undue attention, and are apt to obscure not only the true social inspiration and significance of worship but all other aspects as well.

I have one more observation to make about the regular public services of the Church. First, the divisions of the Christian Church, which at present involve the consequence that we cannot as an united body approach the Lord's Table in the most intimate act of worship and fellowship, are bound to weaken the social significance of public worship much more than any defects in its forms. I would only urge one consideration upon those who are certain that inter-communion should wait upon agreement in dogma and matters of Church order. When Christians of various churches may co-operate in many ways, but may not join in the supreme act of worship together, it may be that inter-communion will continue to seem to be the bright and final goal on which the eye of aspiration will be fixed — it *may* be so. On the other hand, it may equally well be that the many activities in which we can co-operate will assume a greater significance and importance than the one in which we may not. However that may be, so long as the Eucharist seems to be in any sense a symbol of division among Christians, its social significance and implications can hardly fully shine.

Can we rightly be content to set our hearts upon the growth of a truly Christian social life *within* the Church, leaving it so to shine before men that they may thereby be drawn to God through our fellowship? Is it not rather one of the first duties of the Church to bring the people of this land within the influence of the Gospel, and thus to Christ? And as there are insights to be gained, inspiration to be received, and lessons to be learned in worship, in the sanctuary of God, which are not to be gained, received or learned in the same measure elsewhere, we must desire and strive to bring our countrymen within the influences and to the experiences of worship. What can we do to fulfil our mission more adequately?

Sir Thomas More, a good Catholic who died for his faith, wrote that there were different forms of religion among the inhabitants of Utopia,

> 'Yet all these,' he says, 'however various soever, agree in the main point, which is the worshipping of the Divine Essence; and therefore there is nothing to be seen or heard in their temples in which the several persuasions among them may not agree . . . nor is there anything in their public worship that contradicts the particular ways of those different sects.'

He says they perform the rites which are peculiar to themselves in their private houses. This is a high ideal, sufficiently remote. The Psalmist likewise says that he will give thanks 'secretly among the faithful, and in the congregation.' I am sure we need many more services modelled more on the needs of general congregations of men of good will than upon the needs of the faithful and instructed few. This need cannot be met by Mattins and Evensong, with the addition of a special collect or two and a special preacher. Without superseding the regular worship of the Church, I think we should strive to meet modern needs by alternative services of an admittedly special and temporary character if we are to enable men to appreciate the values and the social implications of public worship. Each age has its own particular work to do in advancing the kingdom of God, which it must not shirk. If we are to draw in to the Church for real experiences of worship (admittedly only a beginning) the multitudes who at present do not share in the public worship of the Church as embodied in our forms of services, yet who are by no means indifferent or inactive in matters of social righteousness and well-being, we must have special services of much greater variety and simplicity, which pay some regard to the principle in the words of Sir Thomas More which I have quoted. We must have regard to those who are not at all liturgically minded, as well as to those who are. There are those to whom it is a penance to hear prayers not taken from the Prayer-book; but unless we are to neglect our task, there must be services not only for the few, but also for the many for whom the literary charm and hallowed associations which move us have no existence. If our social teaching and the Christian tradition are cut off from the faith and worship which are their spring and inspiration they must slowly die.

It is widely known that many efforts in devising special services for all sorts and conditions of men have been and are being made as part of the work of the cathedral which I have

the honour to serve. Something on similar lines, according to local needs and opportunities, could, I am confident, be done with good results in churches in large towns. Few churches, of course, have the resources of a great cathedral in a teeming city. But all the churches of a large town could combine and pool their resources on the special occasions, which must be created, for this purpose. All kinds of beneficial social activities, workers already associated in their common callings, can, if some trouble be taken, be induced to come and consecrate all that is good in their various activities within God's sanctuary, at services specially designed to make it easy for them to realize the vital connection between Christian faith and worship and their own lives, and interests, and work. Such services can be permeated by one or two dominating ideals and thoughts, which give them a real unity and a purpose easily grasped; language, symbols, ceremonies and hymns can be chosen in accordance with a simple desire to express in moral, aesthetic and intellectual form the fundamentals of the worship of God in relation to particular aspects or functions of corporate life in the city or town. We can and ought in this way to do more to help the people of great industrial towns to realize the fact of God, for their environment contains so much which makes it easy to forget Him; to give them a home where they can gather as His family (if not a very loyal family); to let that home and the worship within it show forth the Divine beauty, wisdom, love in forms which do not require any special knowledge or the training necessary before the Church's regular forms of public worship can be properly appreciated. We must do more to satisfy, as far as we can, varying needs, and to provide opportunities suited to a wide diversity of temperament and calling; and do this, not with the dominating motive that religion shall be associated solely with churches, but that those who come to realize something of the reality of God in church may come slowly to find Him present in all life's ways and duties. To make such attempts, and to persevere in spite of failures, is of great importance, and experience shews that they will not be made in vain.

MODERNISM AND THE ROMAN CHURCH

GLANCING recently through some books on ecclesiastical history, I lighted on two passages which, read together, opened up an interesting train of thought. One of them was from *The Abbé de Lamennais*, by the Hon. W. Gibson (Longmans; 1896; pp. 217-8), and alluded to the shock endured by that great French Catholic apologist when, in the encyclical *Mirari Nos*, Pope Gregory XVI condemned the ideas through which for so many years Lemennais had tried to explain Catholicism to the progressive world. 'The blow must have been a terrible one. He had reached the age of fifty, and, with a mature mind, had formed an ideal of the true meaning of the Catholic religion. To him this ideal had become a necessary outcome of his faith . . . To Lamennais it was everything, the slow creation of the long years of a painful, struggling life . . . And now all his hopes were shattered, and his whole life must have appeared to him empty and meaningless.' The other passage is from *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, by Cardinal Wiseman (Hurst and Blackett; 1860; pp. 214-5): 'In de la Mennais there was long a canker deeply sunk. There was a maggot in the core of that beautiful fruit. It was only in 1837, when he finished his ecclesiastical career by his *Affaires de Rome*, that the worm had fully writhed itself out, and wound itself, like the serpent of Eden, round the rind. But it had been there all along . . . : the demon of pride and disappointed ambition. Often has one heard good men say in Rome, what a happy escape the Roman Church had experienced from one who had turned out so worthless!'

The second of these two passages—written by a prelate wearing the honours and purple of ecclesiastical eminence—expresses the authentic scorn of sacerdotalism for liberalism of mind. The two passages, side by side, may well preface any study of Modernism in the Roman Church.

According to the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* (x, 415), the actual technical term, 'Modernism,' is nearly two hundred years old. 'J. J. Rousseau, who treated an atheistical philosopher of his time as a modernist, seems to have been the first to use the word in this sense [*i.e.* of 'a radical transformation of human thought in relation to God' and faith]: (see *Correspondence à M.D.*, 15 Jan., 1769). Littré (*Dictionnaire*), who cites the passage, explains: "Modernist, one who esteems modern times above antiquity." After that, the word seems to have been forgotten till the time of the Catholic publicist Périn (1815—1905), professor at the University of Louvain, 1844—1889. This writer, whilst apologizing for the coinage, describes "the humanitarian tendencies of contemporary society" as modernism. The term itself he defines as "the ambition to eliminate God from social life." With this absolute modernism he associates a more temperate form, which he declares to be nothing less than 'liberalism of every degree or shade" (*Le Modernisme dans l'Eglise d'après les lettres inédites de Lamennais;* Paris; 1881).'

At the beginning of the present century liberalist tendencies in theology made themselves felt in Italy very vigorously. In a circular letter published at Christmas, 1905, the bishops of the provinces of Turin and Vercelli denounced them as '*il modernismo nel clero*' ('modernism amongst the clergy'). However, many even of the rigidly orthodox disliked the use of the term 'modernism.' Mgr. Baudrillart, for example (*Revue pratique d'apologétique*, iv, 578), said it implied 'that the Church condemns everything modern.' However, on September 8, 1907, Pope Pius X issued the encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*. It struck relentless blows at the Liberalizing movements, and was definitely headed '*De Modernistarum Doctrinis*' ('Concerning the Teachings of the Modernists'). Since then, Modernism, definitely under that name, has been banned in the Roman Catholic Church.

No study of modernism in that Church can be even approximately adequate without a carefully accurate realization of Rome's conception of the nature of theological truth. The Vatican Council of 1870 summed up that conception succinctly thus (Constitution concerning the Faith, chapter 2): 'Further,

this supernatural revelation, according to the faith of the universal Church, declared by the holy Council of Trent, is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions received from the mouth of Christ Himself or which, dictated by the Holy Ghost to the Apostles themselves, have been handed down, so to speak, hand by hand and have come down to us' (*Haec porro supernaturalis revelatio, secundum universalis Ecclesiae fidem, a sanctâ Tridentinâ Synodo declaratam, continetur in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ipsius Christi Sancto dictante quasi per manus traditae, ad nos usque pervenerunt*).

That is to say, revelation is divine truth clearly and definitely expressed in human words. It is not a mere sentiment, or a cloudy dream, or a series of indefinite ideas. It is truth expressed in permanent verbal categories. That being so, it is not surprising that Pope Pius X, having to express a decision on some forms of modernism which found the truth rather in subjective experience than in objective facts, should declare (Encyclical *Pascendi*): 'And now with our eyes fixed on the whole system, will anyone be surprised that we should define it as the synthesis of all heresies?'

At first sight such a judgment seems, from a Roman Catholic point of view, natural and inevitable. Revelation is truth formally expressed in definite words. Modernists (as the Pope understood them) would substitute, for it, subjectivism: at least, to a considerable degree. 'We have not to compare symbol with symbol, or theology with theology, or to show that one can be deduced from the other. We have to compare life with life; feeling with feeling; action with action' (Father G. Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Crossroads*; 1909; p. 104). In Antonio Fogazzaro's *Il Santo*, again, 'there breathes the note of insistent and pitiless sincerity which will . . . remind the formal tradition of dogma that it is only the imperfect depositary of the living tradition of holiness which is the Church's past: only the provisional, if necessary, instrument of its transmission to the future' (A. L. Lilley, *Modernism*; 1908; p. 131).

At first sight, then, it may seem but natural and inevitable that the Roman Church should condemn 'Modernism' and without mercy cast it from its fold. The Church stands for a definite

revelation expressed in definite words; that type of Modernism which the Pope assailed tended rather to rely on evolutionary subjectivism; therefore the two conceptions are not compatible. 'Pius X infers that the Modernist system is a closely connected whole, and he defines it to be "the synthesis of all the heresies," concetrating into one evil theory their whole sap and substance, with the fatal result that many are the roads it opens leading to atheism and to the annihilation of all religion' (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*; 1917; p. 598).

The matter, however, is by no means so simple as this when we look more deeply into it. Modernists, of course, would challenge the accuracy of the Pope's conception of their position. Let us accept it, nevertheless, as representing Modernism as he saw it; and enquire, Is Rome really so secure after all?

What is ultimate truth? It is nothing but: *the actually existing reality of all that is*: God (whatever the word, God, may mean) and the entire universe of being — suns, planets, life, thought; all, in short, that is. Now, that totality of all that is must be either infinite or at least to us inconceivably immense. So far as we are concerned, however, the truth about it (to such extent as we can know such truth) has to be expressed in the feeble, finite language adapted to our very limited intelligence. That being so, it follows logically that such truth cannot be expressed even approximately adequately. The most perfect expression of it, of which our minds and words are capable, must be immensely far from accurately representing the infinite reality.

Indeed, Roman Catholic theology itself admits that fact. 'The existence,' says the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* (x, 662), 'of theological mysteries is a doctrine of the Catholic faith defined by the Vatican Council, which declares: "If anyone say that in Divine Revelation there are contained no mysteries properly so called (*vera et proprie dicta mysteria*) . . . , let him be anathema"'; and: "the mind of a creature cannot, indeed, grasp the inner nature of the mysterious truth, but it can express that truth by analogies."'

No doubt it would be explained that by theological 'mysteries' is meant merely that there are some things which, by the

very nature of our limited faculties, we cannot understand (*i.e.* infinity and eternity); but that nevertheless the Church's words about them are true so far as they go. Is such an explanation, however, sufficient? If the Church's dogmas are surrounded by —indeed, to a great extent even themselves partake of— mystery beyond comprehension, then probably that mystery contains elements which, if known, would make the dogmas seem very different from what commonly is understood. Who knows? —and, in any case, the very existence of the infinite mystery introduces the factor of incertitude.

We come face to face with such incertitude when we approach particular dogmas. That that of the Holy Trinity is an absolute mystery is not only not denied but also is positively affirmed. 'All Catholic theologians are agreed that the existence of the Trinity cannot be proved by reason, and although they add that the doctrine is above but not contrary to reason, still Billuart at least (*De Trin.*, *Proœm.* a.4) admits that we cannot prove "positively and evidently" that the doctrine does not involve a contradiction' (Addis and Arnold, *Cath. Dict.*, p. 830). The doctrine of the Incarnation is almost equally (though in different ways) mysterious. 'What do you mean by the Incarnation?— I mean by the Incarnation that God the Son took to Himself the nature of man : "the Word was made Flesh"' (Roman Catholic English *Catechism*, qu. 40). Is it needful to mention, however, the innumerable theories (heretical and otherwise) which have been devised to make that mystery intelligible to our minds? 'Every part of the doctrine of the Incarnation has been contradicted by some class of heretics' (Provost Wenham [R.C. theologian], *A Manual of Christian Doctrine*; 1905; p. 40). What is that fact, however, but a result of the further fact that the union of infinite Divinity with a finite human body and soul is a doctrine which cannot be expressed in language? Further, it is not merely *heretics* who have held differing views of it, whether in itself or in its relation to mankind. 'In the Latin Church the doctrine of Atonement does not appear to have been fixed [even so late as] in the eleventh century; at least if we may judge of it by the writings of Anselm . . . The Latin Church was far from having any consistent doctrine of Atonement' (J.

Priestley, *Corruptions*; ed. 1871; pp. 82 and 85). On the great subject of Grace, again, Roman Catholic theologians differ greatly. 'When we inquire into the nature of the distinction between efficacious and sufficient grace, Catholic theologians give different answers' (Addis and Arnold, *C.D.*, 392). That is to put it very mildly! — for the truth of course is that this subject of Grace has caused disputes of vehement violence. That occasioned in the sixteenth century by Molina was but one of many; yet of it Mosheim (*Church History*; trans. Maclaine, 1827; ii, 65) could say truly: 'This alarm was followed by great commotions, and all things seemed to prognosticate a general flame.' The simple truth is, however, that predestination, election, free will, grace, etc., are matters essentially mysterious, and no words of ours can make them clear.

Then there is the doctrine of 'intention.' 'The Council of Trent (sess. vii *de Sact.*, canon 11) requires us to believe that the minister of the sacraments must have "the intention of doing that at least which the Church does." This definition has been the occasion of much controversy within and without the Church. Protestants have attacked it as making the effect of the sacraments uncertain. Catholics have interpreted it variously' (Addis and Arnold, 745-6). 'The majority of school theologians believe that secret withholding of the intention is enough to invalidate the sacrament. Our objection to this, the common theory, is grounded on the fact that its advocates can produce no proof from Scripture or tradition, while we fail to see the force of the argument from reason' (*Ibid.*, 747). Yet this problem, which is so full of uncertainty, affects the whole constitution of the Church: the ordinations of its clergy and the Sacraments they administer.

The doctrine of the Eucharist and the Real Presence brings us to further mysteries. In this article no attempt can be made to discuss those matters generally: nor is it needful for the present argument. One point alone will suffice.

The Council of Trent (sess. xiii, chapter 4) declared: 'And because that Christ our Redeemer declared that that which he offered under the species of bread is truly his own body, therefore has it been always a firm belief in the Church of God — and

this sacred synod now does declare it anew — that, by the consecration of the bread and of the wine, a conversion is made (*conversionem fieri*) of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; which conversion is, by the Holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called transubstantiation.' Amongst the canons annexed to that declaration were these (canon 1): 'If anyone shall say that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are not contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently Christ entire; but shall say that he is therein only as in a sign, or in figure, or by his power: let him be anathema'; and (canon 3): 'If anyone shall say that in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist the entire Christ is not contained under each species, and under every separate particle (*separatione facta*) of each species: let him be anathema.'

The main point with which we need deal here, in regard to the foregoing, is that it is 'of faith' that the entire *body* of Christ is in each Host and in every separate particle of each Host. This seems to imply that, as thousands of Masses are celebrated all over the world every day at one and the same time, there must be in existence at one and the same time thousands (? millions) of entire bodies of Christ! — yet the Church also maintains that Christ has but one body. Many endeavours have been made to escape this apparent absurdity. For example, the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* (v, 583) says: 'If divine omnipotence can in a supernatural manner impart to a body such a spiritual, unextended, spatially uncircumscribed mode of presence, which is natural to the soul as regards the human body, one may well surmise the possibility of Christ's Eucharistic Body being present in its entirety in the whole Host, and whole and entire in each part thereof.' Such an argument, however, seems beside the point. It confuses soul with body, and divests the word 'body' of all meaning. The fact is, the doctrine of transubstantiation not only is a mystery, but is so full of mystery as apparently to contravene the logical 'law of contradiction'; and in any case it cannot be presented clearly to the mind. The philosophical

distinction of 'substance' and 'accidents' merely leaves the puzzle as before, since no clear meaning is given to the terms.

The doctrine of Papal Infallibility, again, is full of incertitude. According to the decree made by Pope Pius IX at the Vatican Council of 1870, 'it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff — when he speaks *ex cathedrâ* : that is, when, in the exercise of his office of shepherd and teacher of all Christians, by his supreme apostolic authority he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals as needing to be held by the universal Church — through the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possesses (*pollere*) that infallibility which our divine Redeemer willed his Church to have in defining doctrine of faith or morals.'

The difficulty is, however : What Papal utterances are to be reckoned as *ex cathedrâ*? Theologians disagree on that vital point. In 1907 Pope Pius X defined Modernism to be the synthesis of all heresies. Was that definition *ex cathedrâ*? Leo XIII, in various encyclicals, condemned the principles of liberty of conscience, separation of Church and State, etc. Were those utterances *ex cathedrâ*? As Dr. C. J. Cadoux (*Catholicism and Christianity*; 1928; p. 30) said : 'It is unreasonable in simple logic to separate off some public and official utterances of the Pope as *ex cathedrâ*, from other public and official utterances which are couched in equally authoritative language and equally assume the right to settle points of faith and morals.'

We come to this, then : *Behind the apparently solid unity and certitude of Roman Catholic belief is really a mass of incertitude, not only as to the real meaning of abstract theological dogmas, but also as to the nature of the teaching authority of the Church and as to how many publicly-taught doctrines actually are binding on the faithful.*

Nearly forty years ago a little book was published in England which analysed in masterly detail this matter of the uncertainty of much Roman Catholic teaching. The Rev. J. Duggan was Roman Catholic priest at Maidstone, Kent. He was a man of learning and deeply religious spirit. In 1897 he published, through Messrs. Kegan Paul, a book entitled *Steps Towards Reunion* Its argument was that the authorities of the

Roman Catholic Church are imposing on their people, both in doctrine and in discipline, burdens not justified by the authority of that Church itself. 'On doctrine can we surrender anything? I show that,' he said (p. 4), 'contrary to what is commonly said by Catholics, we can surrender a vast body of doctrine. We can surrender all that is taught not *by* the Church but *in* the Church *by theologians*.' Developing that thesis, he showed that immense quantities of current teaching amongst Roman Catholics is sanctioned by no definite irreversible decree of the Church, but is merely matter of theological opinion.

Father Duggan's book was placed on the Index: where it still remains. Mere placing of a book thereon, however, does not necessarily mean that its contents are false. It *may* mean that; but it may mean only that the issue of the book is inexpedient. In a privately-printed pamphlet, *The Proposed Sale of Maidstone Presbytery*, published in 1898 (a copy is in the British Museum Library: press-mark, 3940 i 13, 2), Father Duggan made it clear that he had not abandoned the ideas of his book. He died in full communion with the Roman Church.

The truth is that there was much in his contentions which was beyond denial. Theoretically, Roman Catholicism *can* abandon an immense deal: *not only of discipline but also of doctrine*. The reason she does not do so is — conservatism. As we have seen in this article, however, she really possesses much less certitude than seems at first sight to be hers. Amongst the things her conservatism retains are many that are clearly erroneous even on comparatively 'orthodox' religious assumptions. Her present rigid retention of them drives from her fold many — the present writer is one — who would have loved to remain in it.

If Rome were really the uniquely-guided organ of divine truth, the true balance would be preserved, and the maintenance of rigid worldly obscurantism would be needless. As it is, it seems as though such maintenance will continue until a dramatic collapse occurs again as it did in the sixteenth century. That is the perennial tragedy of ecclesiastical rigidity.

J. W. Poynter.

CIVILIZATION AND ITS UNSEEN FOUNDATIONS

By the Rev. J. K. Nettlefold, M.A.

ONE general problem to-day occupies the minds of thoughtful people: what is going to be the future of our civilization? During the recent crisis, when we were looking war in the face, many repeated the familiar phrase, a general war would cause the end of our civilization. Some may have meant only that war would destroy so much wealth and property that the nations would be ruined by it. We should be forced to sacrifice the comforts of civilized life for the discomforts of a new dark age. We are still rather a nation of shopkeepers, and for some the aim of public policy is to keep down the rates.

Others, looking deeper into the problem, foresaw the dislocation of national life which war causes, the destruction of security and the loss of human life. The future leaders of the nations would many of them be killed, and those left to reconstruct the national life would either be too old to face the new problems, or too inexperienced to solve them. People feared a total breakdown of civilization such as occurred in the Russian Revolution. A revolution is a quick way of destroying what is evil and outworn. But it destroys much good too. Uncertainty and fear take the place of the old security. It is easy to pull down, hard to rebuild. It takes years of painful effort before man can again re-establish a stable *régime* in which he can feel relatively safe; and confidence is the necessary basis of civilized life.

Before we talk about the breakdown of civilization we must ask: what is civilization and what are its principles? Can the Nazi *régime* be called civilized? Its principles and methods threaten war. But where they have been adopted has not civilization been already destroyed before war begins? Three in-

teresting books give different answers to these questions.* Mr. Katz in *The Will to Civilization* gives the answer of humanism. In his view civilization is purely the work of man, 'the greatest of all human creations.' Its principles are unity and community, its outward and inward aspects. Man must live with other men, and social life requires order, a power able to enforce obedience and thus hold the human group together. But outward unity needs an inner one, which is the principle of community; this means the willing co-operation of all in the common life. Unity should be free, not forced. If a ruling group or race or class exploits the rest and divides itself from them, community has ceased and unity is precarious.

Mr. Katz traces the course of civilization through history. Three problems wait for man's solution, the economic, the social and the religious. Man must learn how to extract a livelihood from nature, how to build a society with both unity and community, and how to reach a philosophy of life, which is his religion. Mr. Katz' thesis is that true religion is 'faith in civilization.' In primitive times religion is nature worship, because by believing that nature is friendly and the blood-brother of the tribe (totemism) man gained courage in his struggle with nature. In the early empires like the Egyptian the Pharaoh was divine; man was really worshipping the civilization he had made, for the Pharaoh was its representative and ruler. This type of faith has survived into the modern world in the Japanese worship of the divine Mikado. But as the early empires fell man lost faith in civilization. Individualism developed, and man came to believe that he had a soul of his own; he learnt to seek for direct and personal intercourse between himself and God. Religion becomes faith in a God who is transcendent as well as immanent. Man believes that his destiny is not bounded by this world, and the next world often interests him more than this one. This movement is expressed by philosophy with its culmination in Neo-Platonism, and by the universal religions which teach

* *The Will to Civilization*. By John Katz. (Secker and Warburg. 1938. 12/6.)

Liberality and Civilization. By Gilbert Murray. (Allen and Unwin. 1938. 5/-.)

World Community. By William Paton. (S.C.M. 1938. 5/-.)

world-renunciation, especially Buddhism and Christianity.

This is to Mr. Katz the betrayal of civilization and the extreme of false doctrine. He says that all transcendental beliefs are utterly mistaken. If civilization is to survive man must abandon these empty speculations and devote himself to the understanding and mastery of this world alone. 'Metaphysics has no place in the modern world.' With the help of applied science and sociology man must experiment in new ways of forcing nature to give him what he wants, must try new methods of making human society into a community. The problem is great, because economically and materially the world is one. Nothing smaller than a world community will suffice. To be successful man must have faith in civilization. Civilization is the greatest of all human creations. Its construction and perfection are man's highest task.

Mr. Katz insists that man must recover faith in himself, but the method he recommends is not the right one for the modern world. When men lose faith in another world they soon find that this one has not much interest or meaning either. Why should the individual be asked to toil like a bee in a hive for generations he will never see? Again, individualism has grown with the growth of civilization; that men appreciate the worth of personality is a sign of progress. Personal religion has accompanied this development, since the only sure foundation for belief in the value of human personality is faith in God. In trying to discredit individualism and belief in a transcendent God, Mr. Katz has misread human nature and misinterpreted the course of history.

He thinks that transcendentalism is untrue, that this world is all man can know and the only true philosophy is empiricism. But this world does not explain itself. As we try to understand it our attempts at explanation lead us to belief in another. Empiricism is the foundation upon which faith in the goodness and wisdom of God is based, as in the philosophy of Dr. Tennant. Man cannot believe whole-heartedly in the worth of this world, unless he has some transcendental faith to support him. Mr. Katz says that early man's belief in the divinity of nature and of his rulers was simply faith in civilization; but man worshipped them because he thought them divine. He must live

in two worlds, and disbelief in either empties the other of its full meaning. It is difficult to keep the balance true; when life on earth becomes very hard, man fixes his hopes more firmly on another world. That is what Barthianism is doing to-day. The error is not false belief but a wrongness of emphasis.

Mr. Katz' book is hard reading, since the style is clumsy and there are constant repetitions. To read Professor Gilbert Murray after Mr. Katz is like drinking mature wine after sour vinegar. In two lectures delivered at the invitation of the Hibbert Trustees Professor Murray gives his answer to the question: what is civilization? and gives an analysis of the present crisis. His title is *Liberality and Civilization*, and his argument that the civilized man is the liberal man, the free man. What is human freedom? The free man is the man who is free from the compulsions of hunger and the fear of enemies.

> 'He has a reserve of wealth . . . and can give to those who need it more. He has a reserve of security and can afford to be tolerant and to listen to opinions that differ from his own. He has a reserve of leisure from which proceeds all progress, all increase of knowledge and reflection, all sciences and arts. It follows that the free man must be able to think freely. If he is forced into a groove from which he cannot escape he is not a free man; and to think freely he must have freedom of speech.'

Freedom of speech leads to a healthy scepticism. The liberal man stands firm by what he believes true, but

> 'he knows that however hard he tries to learn the truth he can never attain to it in full. Religions, institutions, customs differ widely from region to region, and in all there is truth mixed with error. But one of the most certain things in the world is the moral law. Justice, good faith, kindness, temperance, courage are things admired in the earliest ages of man as well as in the the latest. Against injustice, falsehood, bad faith, cruelty and the denial of the human conscience Liberality stands unshakably firm; for there the centre of its religion is touched.'
>
> 'Liberality is an effort to get rid of prejudice so as to see the truth, to get rid of selfish passions so as to do right. The genuine liberal wants to remedy injustice wherever he sees it, to correct popular sentiments that are leading people astray.'

Are such principles the foundation of civilization? In the popular mind civilization means material well-being, but this is a superficial view which can be dismissed. It is more important to remember that civilized communities preserve their unity by means of force. But as civilization advances the element of force diminishes and the element of mutual help increases. In England to-day the amount spent on the social services is

vastly more than that spent on the punishment of crime. This was not so in Tudor times.

> 'Human society should not be a chaos of warring interests but an ordered whole, in which every individual has his due share of both privilege and of service.'

But to-day human society must embrace all the nations of the earth. Can the nations unite in obedience to truth and justice, the only foundations of true community, or are they capable of nothing more than the unity which is maintained by force? The dictatorships repudiate liberality. Mussolini speaks of 'trampling in the dust the rotting corpse of Liberalism.' In his second lecture Professor Murray speaks of the work of the League of Nations for the establishment of world community, especially of the Committee of Intellectual Co-operation, of which he has been a distinguished member for many years. But the present outlook for such work is dark. His lecture ends with a question mark.

> 'If we wish peace and civilization to continue there is no alternative to justice, there is no alternative to Liberality.'

But how many nations are prepared to do justice and to be guided by the principles of Liberality? In face of threats of war from the dictators those nations that desire civilization must be ready to defend themselves with force against force. But are they ready to make the sacrifices which readiness for war demands? Are they ready to combine so as to make their resistance effective? Will they not suffer one by one the fate of Czechoslovakia?

Professor Murray does not refer to the connection of religion with civilization. This is the subject of Mr. William Paton in the third book under review, *World Community*. He points to the fact that a world community is already in existence, the Christian Church, and asserts that it alone is able to save us in the present crisis. He does not analyse the principles of civilization, but insists that in order to maintain it man needs the power of transcendental faith. Mr. Katz says that man must go on experimenting, following paths leading he knows not where; Mr. Paton says man needs faith in an Absolute.

> 'All over the world there is chaos and disintegration of which the root cause is the fading out of an Absolute, to which the parts of life could be referred and from which they drew their meaning.'

Man is being compelled into a world community. If this is to have the right foundation in the willing co-operation of all and not to be based on force 'the key lies in the recognition of something that transcends human community.' World community must rest on the conviction of the brotherhood of man; Christianity alone can give this doctrine a sure foundation; for it asserts that it rests on the revealed will of God. 'Man is one to whom God speaks, he is one for whom the Son of God was content to die.' 'It says not "become brethren," but "Sirs, ye are brethren."'

This looks well on paper and sounds grand in the pulpit. But how does it work out in practise? The Church is a human society as well as a divine one, and Christians have often been very slow to apply their faith in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man. Slavery was not abolished till eighteen centuries after the Crucifixion; but those most active in its abolition were Christians. It is possible to exaggerate the shortcomings of professing Christians; yet the bravest protests against Nazi tyranny and brutality have often come from German Christians. Mr. Paton shows that in the Mission Field the success of measures for social amelioration, such as the establishment of hospitals and schools, depends on the impetus given by the Christian faith. He writes of South India, for instance:

> 'The reality and magnitude of the change wrought is not doubted by anyone who has studied it. Outwardly it is shown in cleaner villages, in the cessation of litigation which is the curse of the Indian countryside, in economic advance, in literacy and a rise in education, in more freedom and opportunity for women, and in an approach by those "depressed" peoples to the social standards aimed at but not normally achieved by the better caste people. But it would be wholly misleading to suggest that what has happened has in the main been the result of economic and educational activity. The *truth is that where only economic advancement and assistance have been offered little progress has come about,* and that where a definitely religious approach has been made and the spiritual need of the untouchables dealt with, not less seriously and completely than if they were Brahmins, all else has followed in the train of spiritual change.'

Mr. Paton's conclusion is that the Christian Church is able to lead us through the present crisis, if it is true to the great ideals of the Christian faith. World community is possible and in some degree already a fact. The Church will not realize her ideal simply by becoming a universal charity organization, but

by being faithful in prayer and worship, and by seeking strength and guidance from God. Mr. Paton is hopeful; and in these days hope is hard to maintain. In the dictator countries the Church is hampered and persecuted. Dr. Karl Barth warns us that English Christians may soon be enduring the same fate as their German brothers. Through oppression the Church in Germany is becoming again the Church of the catacombs of the Roman Empire. As Christians are denied freedom in this world, they turn their thoughts more to the next. Mr. Katz calls this the betrayal of civilization. But it is worth remembering that whatever of Graeco-Roman civilization survived the barbarian invasions was saved by the Christian Church. New barbarian invaders are on the move, and no one can yet tell how far they will advance. The duty of Christians is to maintain their faith in God, and to continue their Christian witness and work with unflinching resolution. In a mad world the only sure footing is on the rock of God's wisdom and goodness, and it is on this foundation alone that a permanent, progressive and world-wide civilization can be based.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE FOUR HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE

In the year ended, which was the four hundredth anniversary of the publication of the Great Bible, a vigorous attempt was made by the leaders of the Reformed Churches in this country to secure a revival in Bible reading and Bible study. Many sermons and lectures were delivered on these themes: many books published, including a number of new editions of the Scriptures. The Oxford University Press published a beautifully clear large type edition [1] of handy size with a red cover—the Authorised Version which is still much more popular than the revised version with almost everyone except professional Biblical students. Unfortunately, as we venture to think, it does not contain the *Apocrypha*. The Oxford reprint of the Authorised Version surpasses in quality as a typological achievement the Cambridge reprint of the Authorised Version. In price, however, the advantage is with Cambridge.[2]

[1] *The Holy Bible.* The Authorised Version in a new large type edition. (7/6. 1938.)
[2] *The Bible.* Authorised Version. A New Cambridge Edition. (6/-. 1937.)

More interesting, because of its novelty, is a new translation of the New Testament published by the Lutterworth Press under the title of *The Book of Books*.[3] In this new version the translators have judiciously sought to reproduce where possible the rhythm and cadence of the Authorised Version. They claim to have secured fresh light from their study of Tyndale's revised translation and to have made use of Aramaic sources underlying the Gospel texts. Excellent introductions, admirable in their lucidity, restraint and modernity, are prefixed to each of the New Testament books. The type is very pleasant: all Old Testament quotations are printed in italics and the text is arranged in paragraphs, not in chapters and verses.

A very interesting Biblical volume showing perhaps more literary discrimination than the recently published *The Bible designed to be read as Literature* is *The Poetry of the Bible*,[4] by W. Force Stead, himself a poet and for some years a Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. The contents of this selection are best set forth by the Anthologist himself:

> 'Love-songs, songs of triumph and lament, Pilgrim songs, Prayers upon several occasions, the Words of the Prophet, Proverbs and Poems of good counsel, the Pursuit of Understanding, Metaphysical Poems, a Part of the *Book of Job*, The Messiah.'

Mr. Force Stead, and we commend his judgment, makes use of the text of the Authorised Version: but with the following exceptions. In the *Psalms* he uses the English Prayer Book Psalter and in the *Song of Songs* he uses the Revised Version. His selection is a happy one, particularly of passages from the New Testament. We are glad to notice some extracts from the *Apocrypha*. The volume contains a valuable literary Introduction summarising the many attempts to translate portions of the Bible, and particularly the *Psalms*, into English metre.

Another Scriptural Anthology, perhaps more useful but certainly less interesting, is *The Golden Book of Days*.[5] It provides a carefully selected brief Scriptural extract for every day of the year. The selections are made by Mr. G. J. Scott and the Foreword to the collection is contributed by Dr. James Black. True to its Scottish origin this collection does not make use of the *Apocrypha*.

To-day for many English people of the younger generation, if they are to be won to be readers of the Bible, 'the half is greater than the whole.' It is vain to expect them, as some of their fathers did, to read the Bible from cover to cover. They will only read extracts from it and will certainly get far more benefit from this kind of Biblical reading than from the old

[3] *The Book of Books*. The New Testament complete and unabridged. Translation in Modern Paragraph Form. (Lutterworth Press. 2/6. 1938.)

[4] *The Poetry of the Bible*. A New Anthology edited by W. Force Stead. (Cobden-Sanderson. London. 7/6. 1938.)

[5] *The Golden Book of Days*. By George Scott. (James Nisbet. London. 5/-. 1938.)

method. Their fathers read the Bible, prompted by a sense of duty: the younger generation feels no such obligation. If the Bible appeals to them they will read it as they would read any other book. A collection of well-arranged Biblical extracts with brief modern Introductions is therefore the best way of presenting the Bible to our present-day public.

Dean Inge, who contributes the first of the White Lectures[6] *Our English Bible*, notes the decline in Bible reading, and regrets it. He holds that it is due to the lack of belief in the infallibility of Scripture, and to the loss of the old conviction that only through the study of Holy Scripture could eternal life be secured. Modern science, and the critical study of the Bible, are undoubtedly causes for this disbelief in the infallibility of Scripture. But the Dean is convinced that although advance may be difficult, retreat is impossible. Bibliolatry has gone, never to return. Yet, to cease to use the Bible as a moral and spiritual text book must lead to irreparable loss. The remedy must be found in new methods of Bible reading and Bible study.

Dean Matthews in his White Lecture has no fear for the future influence of the Bible but demands a wider method of studying it, particularly in conjunction with Comparative Religion, archaeology and literary criticism.

It is very clear that in England to-day the Bible must lose readers unless the standard of intelligent appreciation of the Bible can be raised. Only as the education of the individual increases in breadth and in depth will he be led to study the Bible with interest and insight. More Biblical education will lead to more Biblical reading. Much more attention would be secured by the Bible if it were better read in public. We once heard one of our greatest authorities on church music say to a body of theological students: That what the English laity demanded in the church services was not better chanting and better singing but better reading of the Scriptures. Mr. Haslehurst in his little book[7] *How to Read the Bible Aloud* provides much useful help for those who desire to read well in Church. He tells the following story:—

> A hospital nurse told him that she, when a probationer, always attended the Temple Church. He said, 'Yes, I suppose everyone would put the choir among the first three in London.'
>
> 'Oh, I did not go for the music: I went to hear Canon Ainger.'
>
> 'Yes, he was a great preacher.'
>
> 'I did not go for the sermon. Very often I had to come out before it. I went to hear him read the Lessons.'

The English Bible[8], a volume of collected essays by Professor Quiller-Couch, the late Mr. A. Clutton Brock, and others, with a Preface by Canon Vernon Storr and an Introduction by Bishop Henson, possesses a quality both of ideas and language which we hope may secure for it a much longer

[6] *Our English Bible.* (Longmans. 2/6.)
[7] *How to Read the Bible Aloud.* By R. S. T. Haslehurst, B.D. (S.P.C.K. 4/-. 1938.)
[8] *The English Bible.* Essays by Various Writers. (Methuen. 3/6. 1938.)

life than is usually the lot to-day of small volumes of essays. Dr. Henson maintains that the national study of the Bible has produced a stability, continuity, moderation and unity in the national life, which other countries, possessed of no such authoritative spiritual and moral text book, have failed to secure. He cites Wordsworth's well-known sonnet on the French Revolution:

> 'No single volume paramount, no code,
> No master spirit, no determined road.'

The sonnet is typical of Wordsworth's tendency to exaggeration when dealing with politics. In politics, the wits are sometimes better vehicles of truth than the poets. The Frenchman who said: 'The English have only two sacraments: the Bible and the Sabbath,' went to the root of the matter. Should we succeed in losing both from our national life, as we seem to be doing at present, we shall certainly see this loss followed by a devastating deterioration in the characteristically English spirit and character.

Clutton-Brock distinguishes acutely (p. 77) between the knowledge of 'curiosity' and the knowledge of 'culture'—that 'disinterested knowledge which every kind of mind requires.' It is comparatively easy for the teacher of the Bible to impart the first kind of knowledge, but the second depends on the quality of the personality of the teacher and the atmosphere of the environment, for as Dean Inge has insisted: 'Religion is caught, not taught.'

Colonel Mozley's book[9], composed on an original plan with the purpose of promoting the study of the Old Testament and *Apocrypha* should be found useful in schools. It sets out succinctly:—

(1) What are the views generally held to-day regarding the Books.
(2) Which parts need not be read.
(3) Which passages or verses are: (*a*) renowned for their importance or beauty; (*b*) in proverbial use or alluded to in secular literature; (*c*) referred to explicitly or implicitly in the New Testament in an important connection.
(4) And of the remainder, which are the more important passages and the 'key' verses.

The *Apocrypha* is also included.

The Old Testament[10] in the Light of Modern Scholarship abbreviated and arranged for use in Home, School and Church, with a Preface by Robert F. Horton, D.D., has had the good fortune to reach its third edition. The Old Testament, in contrast to the New Testament, lends itself to such handling and although many attempts have been made in this direction, we know of none better.

Mr. E. H. Blakeney, a master of Winchester, and a well-known writer of little books, has produced in the series of 'Little Books on Religion' one entitled *The English Bible as Literature*[11]. A galaxy of English writers

[9] *A Guide to the Old Testament.* By E. N. Mozley. (S.C.M. 3/6. 1938.)
[10] *The Old Testament.* By Francis Wrigley, B.A. (Independent Press. 3/6. 1938.)
[11] *The English Bible as Literature.* By E. H. Blakeney. (S.P.C.K. 2*d*. 1938.)

from John Selden to Quiller-Couch, have stressed the literary quality and inspiration of our Authorised Version. The need for the literary study of this 'well of English, pure and undefiled,' was never greater than to-day, when the gutter press and the picture palace are corrupting the English tongue of our half-educated masses.

It is, however, only in school where attendance is regular and compulsory, that such study can be made a national influence. Quiller-Couch's plea for the inclusion of the Authorised Version as a subject in the English Tripos at Cambridge, if granted, would benefit only a very small group of scholars. What is needed is the use of the Bible as a school text book, to teach, not dogmatic religion, but to promote literary, moral and spiritual culture.

A Guide to Understanding the Bible,[12] by Harry Emerson Fosdick, one of America's foremost preachers, is particularly valuable as a contribution to the thoughtful appreciation of the Bible by those who are not scholars. Dr. Fosdick's book exhibits the unity of the Bible — not its literary unity, for it was written by many pens, in many portions, in divers manners, in a succession of periods — but its moral and spiritual unity. He selects six great Biblical themes — God, Man, Right and Wrong, Suffering, Prayer, Immortality — and traces their origin and development in a most instructive and arresting manner. Thomas Fuller wrote:

> 'If any man will not feed on the good meat of the Word, let him not marvel if he be choked with its dry bones.'

The literary and historical critics of the Bible are compelled in many cases by the nature of their research to present only the dry bones to their readers. In the great body of his work Dr. Fosdick presents his readers with a well-ordered selection of the moral and spiritual nutriment which the Bible contains, and has most helpfully relegated the dry bones to the concluding appendices and indices of his volume.

Another volume of outstanding quality in the sphere of Biblical exposition, published in 1938, is *The 'Truth' of the Bible,*[13] by Prof. Stanley Cook, F.B.A. This book consists of a number of papers in which different aspects of the truth of the Bible are treated profoundly rather than systematically. Dr. Cook views the Bible in relation to the whole religious and moral evolution of mankind. With a profound knowledge of the past, especially of the past of the Near East, he is deeply sensitive to the problems presented by our existing moral and spiritual situation and believes that the Bible has an inestimable value in showing us how to solve them rightly. This volume is too important and many-sided to be treated in a brief note. We propose to review it with some fulness on a subsequent occasion.

[12] *A Guide to Understanding the Bible.* By Harry Emerson Fosdick. (S.C.M. Press. Price 10/6. 1938.)

[13] *The 'Truth' of the Bible.* By Stanley A. Cook, F.B.A. (W. Heffer and Sons Ltd. Price 9/-. 1938.)

Last, but not least, we would commend to our readers the excellent series of sixpenny booklets[14] which the Modern Churchmen's Union is contributing to the modern popular understanding of the Scriptures. The first five of the series are: *The Bible and Science,* by the Rev. J. C. Hardwick; *Archaeology and the Old Testament,* by S. H. Hooke; *The Battle of the Old Testament,* by R. B. Henderson; *The Poetry of the Bible,* by Sir Cyril Norwood; *The Messianic Hope,* by the Rev. Paul P. Levertoff.

Those to follow are: *The Bible and the Reformation,* by G. G. Coulton; *Jesus, Who is Called Christ,* by the Rev. L. B. Cross; *The Message of St. John for Modern Readers,* by Canon Mackean; *Who was Jesus? The New Testament Answer,* by the Rev. T. J. Wood; *The Gospel in the Open Air,* by the Rev. W. Donald Soper; *Our Heritage,* by St. John G. Ervine; *What Did St. Paul Mean? His Teaching in Modern Times,* by the Rev. R. G. Griffith.

Four hundred years ago the Reformed Church of England substituted 'the open Bible' for Catholic Sacramentalism and Catholic Tradition as the supreme and needful instrument of Christian education. There are many in the Church of England to-day who doubt the wisdom of that policy and are going back on it. They are wrong, so far as the English people are concerned. If we close the Bible, we shut the doors of the future upon the Christian religion in this land.

It is no easy matter to teach the Scriptures to-day in the light of modern science, modern history, modern criticism, or in the darkness of modern materialism, modern scepticism, modern pessimism and modern paganism. Nevertheless, it is as true for modern English culture and civilization as for ancient Israelite piety: 'Thy Word is a lantern unto my feet and a light unto my path.'

H.D.A.M.

CHRISTIANS OF TODAY*

Dr. Albert Peel has been the editor of the *Congregational Quarterly* for the last fifteen years and has collected together some of his contributions under the title *Thirty-five to Fifty*. They bespeak a variety of interests from theology to cricket, all subject to a dominant interest in mankind and his ways. He pays tribute to Peake and Cadman; he appreciates Randall Davidson and Charles Gore. Dr. Peel is not only a journalist but a minister, and his experience in the former capacity enables him to understand the limitations and dangers of the ministry. He says:

> 'Ministers sometimes forget that they see only a small proportion of the people in the neighbourhood in which they live — and that they do not see even their own folk on their normal, ordinary behaviour.

[14] *After Four Hundred Years Series.* Published by Thomas Murby. (1 Fleet Lane, Ludgate Circus, London, E.C.4. 1938.)

* *Thirty-five to Fifty.* Albert Peel, M.A., Litt.D. (Independent Press. 5/-. 1938.)
J. Taylor Smith, Everybody's Bishop. Maurice Whitlow. (The Lutterworth Press. 2/6. 1938.)

> Every man called to the ministry must contrive somehow to see life *naked*—with all its paganism and poverty, its luxury and lust: only so can he realize what his Gospel has to do and how to bring it to bear' (p. 174).

Dr. Peel discloses that true Christian humanism, which sees life not in blacks and whites but in all its rich variety of shades and tones.

Taylor Smith as portrayed by Mr. Whitlow is a Christian of a completely different emphasis. His religious life began with an experience of conversion at the age of twelve while he was at Kendal. His ministerial career is recorded in Mr. Whitlow's book, but in spite of many stories and sayings narrated of him Mr. Whitlow never appears to touch more than externals and is so partial to the Bishop that we cannot help but feel that his portrait is too good to be true. It is admitted that the Bishop was criticised while Chaplain-General, but we are never told on what grounds or whether with any justification. Taylor Smith, apparently, was a typical twice-born Christian, to use William James' distinction, for whom spiritual force combined with a strong will flowed in a narrow but vigorous stream. His one purpose was to bring men to his Christ, and in that in unexpected quarters, as the biography testifies, he succeeded, but his very purposiveness blinded him to the shades and varieties of life which for men like Dr. Peel make up the richness of life. The Christian humanist and the twice-born Christian are and will remain poles apart, and yet both are necessary in a Christian community.

H. C. Snape.

THE ETERNAL MERCY *

Dr. Hunkin's volume, published in 'The New Library of Devotion,' deserves serious attention. It is entitled *The Mercy of God* and presents what Scripture teaches on this theme with thoroughness and insight, as those who know the Bishop of Truro would expect. The words translated by 'mercy' are examined; and the Prophets and Psalms receive fuller treatment. Then other Jewish writings, the Old Testament, apocryphal, and apocalyptic, with the Psalms of Solomon, Philo, and others, are considered. The standpoint, of course, is critical, *e.g.*:

> 'In the year 333 B.C. Alexander the Great broke the power of the Persian Empire at the battle of Issus, and opened up the nearer East. What should the attitude of the Jews be to this wider world? The Book of Jonah was written to impress upon them a sense of responsibility towards it. The One God is the Creator of the heathen as well as of Israel, and His compassion embraces all the nations. He welcomes their repentance; and to Israel He has committed the task of furthering His purpose for all mankind. Even a prophet has to be corrected before he learns the lesson.'

The same open-eyed outlook, free from convention, views the New Testament, *e.g.*:

> 'St. Paul was a Jew of the Dispersion, brought up at Tarsus. At first bitterly opposed to the Christian movement, he was completely won

* *The Mercy of God.* The Right Revd. J. W. Hunkin, Bishop of Truro. (Nisbet. 2/6. 1938.)

over through a mystical experience. Parallels to his conversion are reported to-day, especially in the mission field. Archdeacon Donithorne told me of a most interesting case which occurred not long ago in Western China. The conversion of Sadhu Sundar Sing in India is a more widely known instance.'

Our Lord's teaching is verified, and His 'view that there was no fault more serious than that of being unforgiving, and God must be the exact opposite,' is illustrated from the Gospels. The rest of the New Testament begins with St. Paul,

> 'whose religion before his conversion must have been of a type similar to that of his older contemporary, Philo of Alexandria, the great exponent of "Catholic Judaism." . . . We must never forget that all St. Paul's lifetime the Temple at Jerusalem was left standing, and the sacrificial system was still in full swing.'

This leads on to an interesting exposition of his teaching on atonement and propitiation in relation to the mercy of God, which is continued into the later teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Augustine, Abelard, and Von Hügel, with a short discussion of 'eternal punishment.' The 'quality of mercy' is illustrated from various sources, Biblical, Rabbinic, Oxyrhyncus papyri, early Christian writers like Tertullian and Jerome, and later Basil and Thomas Aquinas; and the influence of Christianity on the heathen world in fostering mercy, both as an ideal and in practice, is shown. Finally an interesting chapter on 'our own case' offers brief suggestions as to the bearing on faith in God's mercifulness of modern discoveries or experiences in the fields of physics, biology, social science or experiment, and daily life, closing on a note of hope and thankfulness. E. P. Boys-Smith.

ROADS TO REUNION*

This handsome volume is truly good value for money. It consists of a series of essays by different writers, each an expert on his own subject, dealing with the question of the union of the churches from several different angles. It is divided into five sections. The first deals with the Demand for Union, and its opening essay (by the Bishop of New York) is entitled 'The Sin of Disunion.' The second section consists of five able historical essays on 'The Causes of Disruption'; they deal with the Growth of the Papacy (A. W. James); the Division between East and West (Prof. Hamilton Thompson); the Roots of the Sixteenth Century Reformation, (*a*) Ecclesiastical and Doctrinal (Miss B. Hamilton Thompson); (*b*) Sociological and Political (George Every) (this is a very stimulating contribution); and Post-Reformation Developments (T. M. Parker). The third section, on 'Present Groupings of Christendom,' contains essays on the Roman, Eastern (Orthodox and Separated), Anglican (the Dean of Exeter), Scandinavian (Fr. Hebert) and Non-Episcopal Communions. Section Four deals with 'The Possibility of a United Christendom,' containing essays on the standpoint of various churches: Roman (Rev. H. Beevor), Eastern

**Union of Christendom.* Edited by Kenneth Mackenzie, Bishop of Brechin. (S.P.C.K., 1938. pp. 702. 8/6 net.)

(Dr. N. Arseniev), Anglican (Archbishop Wand), Scandinavian (Rev. Einar Molland), American Lutheran (Dr. F. H. Knubel and Prof. C. M. Jacobs), and Non-Episcopal: Presbyterian (Rev. J. Wilson Baird), Methodist (Dr. W. F. Lofthouse), Congregational (Dr. C. J. Cadoux), and Baptist (Dr. R. Ashworth). This is probably the most valuable section of the book, because it teaches us a great deal about the contemporary attitude of the churches. We are grateful for the breadth of vision and charity of Dr. Wand's contribution; he reasons that the Anglican conception of unity without uniformity is the only practical course of action. He thinks that 'the Nicene Creed will be found a sufficient doctrinal basis for the Church of the future' (p. 417).

> 'If we are to wait for a complete agreement on every detail of opinion we shall wait for ever. In the whole history of the Church there never has been complete unanimity; and it is safe to say that there never will be so long as the conditions of time and space prevail. The way out will most probably be found through taking common action on the basis of a general agreement and leaving that action to lead us to an ever closer approximation of faith. . . . The New Testament itself presents us with a considerable variety of presentations of the one faith' (p. 416). 'We need not be afraid of those who say that this would have to be one church with two or more religions. Nor need we be afraid of those who say that it would mean sacrificing principle in favour of comprehension. . . . To-day, with the new movement towards reunion, we have begun to discover again that comprehension is a noble, even a divine, principle' (p. 417).

As we read some of the other points of view represented in this section, we shall feel proud of our Anglican heritage, and glad of Dr. Wand's statement of it. The standpoint of the Eastern Church (as represented by Dr. Arseniev), for example, is that everyone else must toe the Orthodox doctrinal line before union with Orthodoxy is a possibility; thus:

> 'When this teaching has been fully accepted by the Roman Church in all its implications, the way for Reunion between the two Catholic Churches of the West and the East will be facilitated' (p. 386).

The last section deals with the 'Essential Principles of Catholicism,' and is written from the Anglo-Catholic standpoint. A general criticism of the volume might reasonably be that it would have been more valuable if it had been written from a more representatively Anglican point of view; but, on the other hand, the book as it stands is valuable in that it proves the genuine concern of our Anglo-Catholic brethren for unity. Perhaps they have something to teach us here! If the book has the merits, it also has the defects, of an Anglo-Catholic point of view; for instance, the chapters which deal with society and social problems reflect the mediaeval Utopianism of the Anglo-Catholic school of 'Christian Sociologists.' And it is a great pity that the significance for the Reunion movement of the whole Life-and-Work oecumenical approach receives but scant notice: the last chapter of the book ('A Christian Social Order,' by Canon B. Iddings

Bell) was actually written *before* the Oxford Conference of July, 1937, took place. There is something sadly defective here in a book of this kind; some of the most relevant facts are being left out. Yet, despite such criticisms, we must conclude by expressing the hope that the book will be widely read. Those who are interested in the question of reunion will want to study this book; those who are not interested should be made to study it.

ALAN RICHARDSON.

'THE OLD, OLD STORY' RE-TOLD*

In spite of the assurances of some scholars that we can know nothing with certainty about the Jesus of history, lives of Christ still flourish, and interest in the historical Jesus remains unabated. The sons of the late Sir Hall Caine have published the material of a life of Christ which their father had been compiling and collecting for nearly forty years. Hence the book takes much more the form of a commentary on the Bible than a life of Christ. Sir Hall Caine is shown to have perceived that the life of Christ cannot be studied in isolation, and perhaps he would have reduced his study of the Old Testament to the limitations of a preface. For the most part it consists of a paraphrase unsupported by any clear conception of primitive religion or any trace of the development of ethical monotheism.

Anyone who commits himself to writing a life of Jesus must be competent to handle the historical method; he must be a psychologist; and also be possessed of something that is like Jesus. Erudition is indispensable; where it is lacking, a life of Jesus is likely to turn out to be a flight of fancy or an instrument of propaganda; where there is nothing else, essential elements are missing.

Sir Hall Caine's work shows complete sympathy with the Christian evaluation of Jesus and as might be expected an insistence upon the humanity of Jesus, but in spite of evident study even, as the editors inform us, to the extent of many visits of exploration to Palestine he failed to become a master of the historical method. While it is permissible to present a life of Jesus in dogmatic form either as a psychological study or in the frame of a religious dogma, admitted probabilities, suppositions and suggestions need circumstantial support and analysis to be of value. Discussing the gospels Sir Hall Caine writes:

> 'It is possible that before the first of St. Paul's letters there was a Gospel written, perhaps by Matthew, who being a tax-gatherer, may be presumed to have had, to some extent, the pen of a ready writer. This Gospel is now known as *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, and was almost certainly written in Aramaic. It is now lost, except in so far as passages have been incorporated in the Gospels that come later. It is probable that this Gospel was of the nature of Sibylline

* *The Life of Christ.* By Hall Caine. (Collins. 10/6 net. 1938.)
With Jesus in Palestine. By the Rev. H. J. Macdonald, D.D. (Skeffington. 3/6 net. 1938.)

> leaves, that it was passed from hand to hand among the disciples, and that if anybody remembered anything not included in it, he either inserted his recollection or mentioned it to Matthew for inclusion' (p. 247).

Possibilities and probabilities are thus entertained without any evidence. Information appears to have been collected without being thoroughly sifted and digested. In fact St. Jerome states that he found at Caesarea a copy of a gospel in Aramaic which he translated into Latin and Greek. His quotations from it and fragments survive which have led scholars to pronounce that there is nothing in them to justify the identification of this Aramaic Gospel with the original of Matthew. Unfortunately throughout the book the results of research are treated in this manner.

It is perhaps noteworthy that while Sir Hall Caine rejects both on grounds of dogma and of the evidence of the documents the story of the Virgin Birth, he accepts the conception of the death of Jesus as an atoning sacrifice. He traces a development of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus but considers that Jesus finally thought of himself not only as the Messiah but as the Son of God who by his death atoned to God for man's sins. No evidence is produced for this assertion; Sir Hall Caine believes that Jesus received this idea directly from Moses and Elijah.

Sir Hall Caine's *Life of Christ* will have an importance, because it reveals how far an evangelical Christian at the beginning of the twentieth century was prepared to allow historical criticism to take him. This generation, however, will not discover the Jesus of history in it, and being induced to read it by the glamour of the name of a popular novelist may easily be misled by assumptions which appear to be based on historical research but in reality are unwarranted.

In contrast with Sir Hall Caine's portentous volume, a collection of twenty sermons entitled *With Jesus in Palestine,* by Dr. A. J. Macdonald, present a sober, succinct and scholarly summary of the teaching of Jesus. We should, however, like to know where we are to find

> 'the pathetic spectacle of some Modernists reverting to a worn-out Unitarianism, and asserting that Christ was only man' (p. 31).

But all Modernists would whole-heartedly agree with Dr. Macdonald's statement about Jesus and truth. For he writes:

> 'A rejection of Truth is a rejection of Jesus, because He said, "I am the Truth." We shall never cease to discover fresh avenues in the forest of Truth. Some of that forest is still virgin, untouched, unexplored. Every fresh discovery, every new step towards reform, every fresh movement in progress, is a discovery of Jesus, of Truth, and every attempt to hold up progress, development, change, whether in things social, political, or religious, is a rejection of Jesus' (p. 68).

Dr. Macdonald interprets the teaching of Jesus in that spirit and appears to be more of a Modernist than he is prepared to admit.

H. C. Snape.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

OUR LORD'S CALL TO REPENTANCE.

SIR,

In his sermon on 'The Modernism of George Eliot' in the January number of the *Modern Churchman* Mr. Moyle says of our Lord, 'His earliest message was "change your thinking" (Greek; *metanoeite,* inadequately translated "repent")' (p. 543). With the preacher's translation of the Greek we can have no quarrel, but it is usually agreed, even if the implications for exegesis are not as usually recognised, that our Lord spoke Aramaic and not Greek. Consequently his 'earliest message,' if we are to trust St. Mark, will have been not *metanoeite* but *tubhun,* which means 'turn back,' and is the same semitic root as that used by Ezekiel in the first of our Prayer Book sentences, 'When the wicked man *turneth away* from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive.' The idea of 'change of mind' which has become associated with repentance from the Greek Testament is every bit as inadequate as an expression of the original meaning as is the idea of 'sorrow' derived from the *paenitemini* of the Latin. Whatever meanings the Church may have subsequently added by translation, there can be no doubt that the Call to Repentance as uttered by our Lord was a summons to a change, not of emotions, nor yet of minds, but of actions. By their fruits should men be known.

There is of course nothing new, or even 'modern,' in this: *e.g.* the scholarly Bishop Beveridge of St. Asaph, well over two hundred years ago, enlightened his congregation on the point with a wealth of philological detail. It is one of those many cases where our excessive concentration on the Classics to the almost total neglect of Semitics has seriously warped our interpretation of the New Testament. If it were a matter of purely academic interest I would not trespass upon your space, but the approach of the Lenten season, when sermons will doubtless be preached on Repentance, prompts me to claim your readers' attention in the hope that some congregations at least may be spared a very irritating (because so deep-rooted) exegetical blunder.

HEDLEY F. D. SPARKS.

Hatfield College, Durham.
January 20th, 1939.

[Bishop Beveridge was spoken of by his contemporaries as 'the great restorer of primitive piety.'—ED. M.C.]

PRAYER BOOK REVISION.

SIR,

I should like to support the suggestion of your correspondent Miss Vine (*M.C.,* November, 1938), namely that Modernists should strive to eliminate such portions of the Prayer Book as, in her phrase, 'consist largely in beseeching an apparently reluctant God to "have mercy upon us."' Such

prayers can, surely, hardly ever represent with sincerity what a religious Englishman feels about the relationship of himself to his Maker, and the incumbency laid upon him by the Prayer Book to give public expression to sentiments of abject unworthiness which he cannot honestly claim to feel, must often constitute an unspoken but very real reason for non-attendance at church.

Miss Vine gives the psychological argument for the discontinuance of this form of prayer or response. There is, I feel, an equally valid theological argument, which cannot stop short, as Miss Vine seems to suggest, at the more extreme forms of the 'beseeching' prayer which she instances. Larger issues than psychological expediency are involved, namely, the whole question of the validity of supplicatory prayer. The Modernist will agree that progressive revelation is an unending process, and in so far as it relates to this question, it would seem that the essential nature of prayer is being revealed not as supplication, but as concentration of the attention upon God. Prayer, in so far as it is verbal at all, thus assumes the character of a creed rather than of a plea. In this connection I should like to know what authority there is for the view, which I have seen stated, that the Lord's Prayer was originally given in this form: 'Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed is thy name. Thy kingdom is come. Thy will is done in earth as it is in heaven. Thou givest us this day our daily bread. And forgivest us our trespasses, etc.' This is certainly hypothetical but even as such it would resolve the dissonance between the two clauses which in the present version run (*a*) Thy kingdom come, (*b*) For thine is the Kingdom.

EDWIN V. MILNER.

The School House, Brayton,
nr. Selby, Yorks.
January 14th, 1939.

[It is impossible to translate the Greek of the Lord's Prayer in the way in which our correspondent suggests. The main clauses of the Prayer express desire or supplication. The concluding Doxology was, so textual criticism indicates, no part of the original Lord's Prayer but was added by primitive Jewish Christians in accordance with the Jewish mode of worship. It is one of a class of very interesting liturgical additions made to the original text of the New Testament. There seems to us to be nothing in our Lord's teaching which prohibits supplicatory prayer, but very much which supports and even advocates the practice: 'Ask and ye shall have, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you.'—ED., *M.C.*]

SIR,

It shows how very difficult a revision of the Prayer Book would be if conflicting 'reforms' are to be put forward.

Miss E. E. Hart in the January *Modern Churchman* agrees with Miss Vine in thinking many of its phrases 'express cringing slavishness' rather than frank trust, in crying for God's mercy.

I cannot agree with either of their conclusions as to this.

As long as we need forgiveness, we need to cry for mercy in the spirit of Saint Paul who although in high hopes of 'the prize of the high calling of God' yet counted himself but on the way, attaining, apprehending, and following after, reaching forth into those things which are before.

This strikes a more humble note than to assume the fight is over, the battle won. As we have trusted in the past, so we may hope and pray that we shall never be confounded in the uncertain future, which is only certain by the help of God's mercy and grace.

'Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.'

K. PRYNNE.

Basset Garth, Penn, Bucks.
January 24th, 1939.

SIR,

I am very sorry to spoil Miss Hart's excellent emendation of the Te Deum, but I fear that she, like many others, has been misled by the bad Latin of the Vulgate. The last verse of the Te Deum is copied from Psalms xxxi.1 and lxxi.1, where the Septuagint quite correctly has *μὴ καταισχυνθείην*.

The Vulgate has *non* for *ne* also in Psalms xxxi.19 and xxxv.24,25—'Let them not.' It is nothing unusual.

T. F. ROYDS.

Haughton Rectory,
Stafford.

THE MOTHER'S UNION AND DIVORCE.

SIR,

I enclose a statement issued by the Enrolling Member of a Branch of the Mothers' Union, as I think it right that the attitude adopted by the Central Executive Committee should be made public, in the hope that this will lead to a more charitable and tolerant basis.

Only one in close touch can appreciate the strong resentment felt by women who have been recruited to join, and help to run, a Branch of the Union, and who, after they have learnt to enjoy the fellowship and appreciate the really good work of the Union, are told that their membership is no longer desired, for reasons mentioned in the statement.

I know that several, at least, of the Bishops, whilst joining in the general admiration of the work of the M.U., regret its attitude on this matter, and readers will remember that the Archbishop of Canterbury did not feel prepared to vote *against* the Matrimonial Causes Bill. Yet the Union claims as its Patrons 'The Bishops of the Anglican Communion.'

A letter from a clergyman appeared in the *Church of England Newspaper* of the 23rd December, with some very searching and awkward questions relating to the definition of the First Object of the M.U., consultation with Branches, and the appointment of the Central Committee, but there has not been an answer from the Union in any of the succeeding four issues.

It would be interesting to know whether the Central Council would accept a challenge to insist that every member of the Union shall sign an affirmation that marriage cannot be dissolved in any circumstances except by death—non-signature to involve dismissal from the Union? And if it would not, why is one Branch closed?

W. W. NORRIS.

51 Twyford Court,
Fortis Green, N.10.
January 21st, 1939.

THE MOTHER'S UNION AND ST. MATTHEW'S (MUSWELL HILL) BRANCH.

1. During recent months the Members of our Branch have been much troubled by what they considered the rigorous attitude towards divorce that some speakers from the Mothers' Union have taken.

2. We therefore wrote to the Central Secretary asking her to put our views before the Central Council. We stated: We hold whole-heartedly the Three Central Objects of the Mothers' Union, and we accept, as an ideal, the definition of the First Object, *i.e.* 'the Christian principle of the permanence of the relationship between husband and wife.' We do not, however, agree with the Central Council's interpretation of this definition, and we cannot affirm that in no circumstances can this relationship be terminated except by death.

3. In reply we were informed by the Central President that 'the Central Executive Committee . . . could not forward your request to the Central Council as there has never been any doubt in the Central Council about the question you have raised. . . . As your interpretation of the First Object is not in line with that of the Central Council, they (the Committee) regretfully feel that it would not be possible for your Branch to remain part of the Mothers' Union.'

4. We were not aware when the Branch was founded, nor have we been until recently, that the Union took such a strict attitude on this question.

5. In any reference to our 'dismissal' from the Union, the Central Secretary has asked us to state that 'the Mothers' Union is a voluntary association of women who desire to witness to what they believe to be the ideal of Christian marriage, but they have no desire to condemn those who think differently.'

6. The St. Matthew's Parochial Church Council have recently passed the following resolution: 'The Council approves the action of its Chairman and of the Officers and Members of the St. Matthew's Branch of the Mothers' Union, and notes with regret that the Union is unable to retain as members Christian women who by their lives as wives and mothers have upheld the high standard of the Three Objects of the Union.'

(MRS.) K. M. NORRIS,
Enrolling Member.

[The letter of our correspondent seems to us to deal with a matter of grave importance. The action of the authorities of the Mothers' Union seems to us to go beyond what is permitted to it by the terms of the Royal Charter which it holds, and in which it is stated that its purpose is to promote the following three Central Objects:—

(1) To uphold the sanctity of marriage.

(2) To awaken in all mothers a sense of their great responsibility in the training of their boys and girls (the Fathers and Mothers of the future).

(3) To organise in every place a band of mothers who will unite in prayer and seek by their own example to lead their families in purity and holiness of life.' (*Official Handbook* of the Mothers' Union, 1938, p. xxxi.)

If it be claimed that to sanction the granting of divorce in any case is not to uphold the sanctity of marriage, then our Lord as cited twice in St. Matthew's Gospel, was guilty of this offence. We feel it to be desirable in the interests of the influence of the Church on the nation that our more liberally-minded bishops and clergy should take up this matter with the Mothers' Union.—ED., *M.C.*]